

GAGGING THE PRESS.

Archbishop Corrigan Sends a Threatening Letter to the Catholic "Herald."

The following interesting and characteristic document by a strange series of accidents, unnecessary to describe, came into our hands. Its publication will surprise no one more than the gentlemen to whom it is addressed. We do not feel bound by the obligation of secrecy which the writer seeks to impose on those gentlemen. We sincerely hope that he will not excommunicate the editor and the proprietor of the Catholic Herald for our publication of the letter, and we hardly think he will deem it worth his while to excommunicate us:

432 MADISON AVENUE,
NEW YORK, April 13, 1887.

To the Editor and Proprietor of the Catholic Herald:

GENTLEMEN—By this note, which is entirely private and not to be published, I wish to call your attention to the fact that the third plenary council of Baltimore, following the leadership of Pope Leo XIII, has pointed out the duties of the Catholic press, and denounced the abuses of which journals styling themselves Catholic are sometimes guilty. "That paper alone," says the council (decree No. 238), "is to be regarded as Catholic that is prepared to submit in all things to ecclesiastical authority." Later on it warns all Catholic writers against presuming to attack publicly the manner in which a bishop rules his diocese, affirming that those who so presume, as well as their approvers and abettors, are not only guilty of very grievous scandals, but deserve, moreover, to be dealt with by canonical censures.

For some time past the utterances of the Catholic Herald have been shockingly scandalous. As this newspaper is published in this diocese, I hereby warn you that if you continue in this course of conduct it will be at your peril. I am, gentlemen,

Yours truly,

M. A. CORRIGAN,
Archbishop of New York.

THE SHOEMAKER'S FIELD.

In the days when New York was regarded as a walled city and its whole population was crowded on the southern point of Manhattan island, certain sanitary reformers objected to the continuance within the city limits of the tan pits maintained by a number of shoemakers in the old swamp, which then lay on both sides of what is now Broad street. The result was that the shoemakers were driven to seek a new location beyond the city walls, and in a marshy valley along Maiden's path, now known as Maiden lane, they obtained some sixteen acres of land, on which they established tan pits, it being the custom at that time for cordwainers or shoemakers to tan their own leather. It appears that the original owners of the land were Conrad Ten Eyck, Jacob Abrahams, John Harpending (or Harberdinck) and Carsten Lueresen. There is some confusion as to these names in the early annals, for at the time of the division of the property in 1696 it appears that the owners were John Harberdinck, Heitje Clopper (described as the widow of one of the original grantees), Charles Lodwick (described as a merchant who had in the year 1694 bought the interest of Hendrick Ten Eyck), Abraham Santvoort (apparently the same man called Jacob Abrahams in the earlier account) and Carsten Lueresen.

In 1696 a deed of partition, accompanied by a map, was made and filed, by which it appeared that John Harberdinck (so he signed his name to his will), became the owner of certain lots indicated by shading on the accompanying reproduction of the old map, and also of all the lots on Broadway not included in the shading, now the property of various individuals. This John Harberdinck, or Harpendinck, who was also called John Harpending, speaks of himself in his will as a cordwainer and also as a merchant. He is described as "an aged, excellent and influential member of the church, who frequently officiated as elder and deacon." He was married in this city in 1667, shortly after the transfer of the colony from the Dutch to the English, and he died in 1722 at an advanced age, leaving no children. By a will dated April 22, 1722, John Harberdinck, after giving a number of specific legacies to certain relatives of his own in Holland and also to certain relatives and connections in this country, made the following bequest:

"I, the said John Harberdinck, do hereby give, devise and bequeath unto the said minister, elders and deacons of the Reformed Protestant Dutch church of the city of New York, and their successors forever all that my testator's right, fifth interest and property to an equal fifth part, share and proportion of all that tract or parcel of land situate, lying and being upon Manhattan island, within the city of New York, called or known by the name of Shoemaker's field, or lane, on the north-east side of Maiden lane or path which leads into a certain street called Queen's street; the which said tract or parcel of land contains, by estimation, about sixteen acres, and by mutual consent, agreement and approbation of all the proprietors or part owners therein concerned some years past was surveyed and laid out into one hundred and sixty-four lots, with convenient streets and lanes to accommodate the same, as may fully and amply appear by a certain instrument of inclosure . . . by which . . . it is declared that John Harberdinck's property share in the said one hundred and sixty-four lots shall be and consist in five and thirty lots, . . . together with four other lots or pieces of ground more out of the five lots mentioned," lying on Broad-

way. All of this property, owned by him at

that time, indicated on the accompanying map by shaded lines, he devised to the ministers, elders and deacons of the church, and to their successors forever, "immediately after the death and decease of my wife, Mayken Harberdinck, and only to the proper use, benefit and behoof, and for the payment and satisfying of the yearly stipend, salary and maintenance of the respective minister or ministers which from time to time and at all times hereafter shall be duly and legally called to the ministry of said church, and to no other use whatsoever. . . . Provided always that it shall not be within the power of the said lawful ministers, elders and deacons, . . . nor in the power of any other person or persons whatsoever hereafter, to make sale, dispose or alienate any part of the said lands and premises, nor any of the profits, benefits, revenues or advantages arising out of the same to any other use or uses whatsoever, but that the same shall be forever and remain to the only proper use, benefit and behoof as above is recited, declared and expressed."

The property thus bequeathed is, as a glance at the map will show, in the very heart of the business portion of lower New York, and it has been the source of the magnificent revenue of the Collegiate Dutch church, the history of which was given in last week's STANDARD. A liberal construction of the terms of the will would appear to forbid any application of the funds derived from the estate to any other purpose than the payment of ministers' salaries, and were the fund thus applied the revenue now probably would be sufficient to provide for the support of a hundred Christian ministers in as many parts of the city.

The Reformed Protestant Dutch church of the city of New York was incorporated by letters patent under the great seal of the colony of New York, May 11, 1696, by which the church was then erected and certain lands were granted and confirmed to the corporation, and it was authorized to purchase and hold other lands not exceeding a yearly value of £200. More than half a century ago it became evident to the casual observer that the church was deriving a revenue vastly beyond £200 a year from its property on the old shoemaker's field, and one Van Kleeck, a descendant of one of the residuary legatees under John Harberdinck's will, came forward to question the right of the church to its rich heritage. He demanded that it should be compelled to declare the title by which it claimed to hold these lands, and that it should make an exhibit of its accounts so as to show the sources and extent of its income. The applicant showed that after his bequest to the church John Harberdinck gave the remainder of his estate to his wife, Mayken Harberdinck, for her life, and after her, to various parties, one-fourth of it going to the children of Baltus Van Kleeck, through whom the plaintiff claimed. He further claimed that even if the land described in the deed of partition was legally the property of the church that a certain undivided piece of land between Fulton and John, Nassau and William streets, marked in the map as a vacant lot and declared in the said deed to be still held by the original owners in common, was not included in the bequest to the church.

The case was vigorously contested by able lawyers on both sides, and it reached the court of appeals in 1838. Van Kleeck declared his belief that the lands held by the church at the filing of his affidavit yielded a yearly income of \$30,000, and he complained that the officers of the corporation had refused to be sworn. The church apparently made no attempt to defend its legal title to the land in question on any other ground than that of possession. It simply denied that Van Kleeck

had any claim to it under the will, and insisted that he could not compel the church corporation to make any disclosure of its title or render any statement of its affairs. The question practically narrowed itself down to this: Admitting that the church has no legal right to these lands, to whom do they fall, the residuary legatee or the heir at law? This was the question argued before the court of appeals, and the final decision of the majority was that the residuary legatees had no claim whatever to the property under the will, and that, therefore, Van Kleeck had no standing in court and was not entitled to compel any disclosure on the part of the trustees.

Chief Justice Nelson read the opinion, and he said: "It is admitted, for the purpose of this decision, that the devise to the church is void, that body being incapable, as the law stood at the time, of taking or holding real property by devise. The question is, 'Does the property go to the residuary devisees?' The decision of the court was that, on the contrary, the testator especially excluded them from the property devised, and that the only claimant entitled to dispute the title of the church is the heir at law. Justice Cowan, in a dissenting opinion, said: 'Were it necessary to consider the question in respect to the exception of bodies corporate in the statute of devises of Henry VIII the point would not be so clear. This country was, except in the greater amount of unseated land, as much open to the evil of corporate perpetuities, especially those of ecclesiastical concoction, as the country from which we immediately derive our blood, our habits, our laws and our religion. The church has in all ages had agents whose mistaken zeal was ready to turn the dying fears of testators to the purposes of pious testamentary donations. The question, therefore, lay between depriving it of corporate powers altogether or restricting its power of taking by devise, and the latter was adopted. It is a policy, in fact, to this day common both to the English statutes and to our own.'"

The statute of devises of Henry VIII alluded to by Justice Cowan is claimed by some to be a part of the law of the land in this country, because it was in force at the time of our separation from England and has never been specifically repealed. It was only one of many statutes enacted from time to time in England to guard against the very abuse referred to by Justice Cowan. Such a devise of land to any body politic, ecclesiastical or lay, was forbidden by statute of Edward I, and the lord of the fee was authorized to take possession of such lands, and in his default it was enacted that such lands should go to the king. In the course of time this provision was extended to all lands purchased for the use of guilds, fraternities and so on. When testamentary power over freehold lands was granted during the reign of Henry VIII, bodies politic and corporate were especially excluded from the benefit of the statute. It is greatly to be regretted that a similar jealousy against surrendering the control of land to an undying corporation in perpetuity has not characterized legislation and legal rulings in the United States. It may, however, turn out in the end that such abuses have grown up, particularly in this city, will serve a useful purpose of recalling to men's minds the ancient doctrine and usage which makes the sovereign—that is, in this country, the people—sole owner of the soil. When such a principle comes to be recognized we shall have an end of the doctrine of adverse possession by which the Dutch Reformed and Trinity churches claim and exercise the power to levy enormous taxes for corporate benefit on the land of this island. Then, in the case of a void bequest, like that of John Harberdinck, to a corporation forbidden by law to

receive such a bequest, where no man having any legal right as a tenant appears, the paramount lords of the soil, the people, will be awarded the land, the right to possess which is in dispute.

The Reformed Protestant Dutch church of New York possesses a fifth of the old shoemaker's field by a title that cannot be defended on moral grounds. It puts the revenue from that property, as has been shown in a previous paper, to no public use. It uses its funds to pay aristocratic preachers for ministering in costly churches, built from the revenue of the estate, to rich and fashionable congregations abundantly supplied with churches for themselves and to pay for such preaching as suits them. The exact income thus derived and spent it is not possible to state. That it is very great is however beyond dispute. Estimates as to the income derived by the church from the shoemaker's field property vary from \$125,000 to \$150,000 a year. In a few instances we have definite facts. The lot having a twenty foot front on Broadway and running one hundred and sixty-two feet ten inches along John street, and indicated on the map, is in some respects undesirable, because the straightening of John street since the original plot was made has greatly narrowed its Broadway front. On May 1, 1886, this lot was leased to Austin Corbin for twenty-one years at \$18,000, it being a part of the bargain that Mr. Corbin should within three years erect thereon a brick and stone building to cost at least \$200,000. At the end of the twenty-one years, according to the lease, the annual rental value of the ground and the value of the building are to be fixed by arbitrators, and the church may choose whether it will buy the building at the appraised value or renew the lease at the rent thus fixed.

Another lot at Broadway and Fulton street, now occupied by the Evening Post building, was leased to William E. Fleming, George Roll, John Belger and Charles L. Fleming in May, 1865, for twenty-one years at \$19,000 a year on condition that the tenants should erect a building thereon worth at least \$50,000. Between the lot thus leased and Fulton street there was a strip four feet eleven inches in width, running the whole length of the lot. Fleming and others transferred their lease to William Cullen Bryant and Isaac Henderson on Feb. 27, 1873, and Mr. Bryant transferred his interest to Mr. Henderson on the first of May following. Henderson had, in some way, acquired possession of the narrow strip on Fulton street, and he sold it to the church for \$120,000, and the church thereupon leased the whole lot thus enlarged to Henderson for sixty-three years from May 1, 1874, at \$31,000 a year for the first twenty-one years, \$35,000 a year for the second twenty-one years, and at not less than \$35,000 a year for the third twenty-one years. Mr. Henderson thereupon built the present Evening Post building on the lot. Adding to this \$31,000 the \$18,000 paid by Austin Corbin, it appears that the church receives \$49,000 a year in ground rent from its two Broadway lots. It is difficult to estimate its exact receipts from the remaining lots. Four and a half lots appearing on the original plan have since been subdivided into ten lots, yielding the estate \$14,000 a year, which would be at the rate of \$3,111 for each of the original lots. A lot on William street having a front of 40 feet and a depth of 96 feet, which rented in 1845 for \$1,080, was leased again last May for \$1,900. A lot fronting on John street 25 feet, leased in 1865 for \$700, was again leased last year at \$1,100 a year. This is one of the smallest lots on the tract, and doubtless represents the minimum rent. It would be a moderate estimate to put the average rent of each lot at \$2,000 a year, or \$70,000 for the

whole 35. Adding to this the \$49,000 received for the two Broadway lots, we have a total income for the church of \$119,000 a year from the fifth part of the old swamp granted to the five shoemakers for their tan vats. This calculation leaves out the interest of the church in what was formerly the undivided vacant lot shown on the map, which is now thickly built up. Allowing but \$8,000 for this, the annual income is brought up to \$127,000 a year.

This, however, is not the whole revenue of the corporation. The lot on which the old postoffice stood was not a part of the Harberdinck bequest and it was alienable. The church sold it to the federal government for \$200,000. It probably sold the site of the old Garden street church and invested the money. The consistory purchased the site of the Lafayette street church when land was cheap in that neighborhood, and now that building has been torn down to make way for a large building for manufacturing purposes on its site which has already been rented in advance of its erection at \$12,500 a year. This shows that the income of the estate is growing more rapidly than the consistory can spend it, so that, if no change be made, it will fifty years hence be another one of the rich corporations authorized by absurd laws to levy an enormous land tax on the business people of New York to raise funds for no useful purpose whatever.

But old John Harberdinck only bequeathed a fifth part of the shoemakers' field to the Dutch church. The other four-fifths of the property passed to private persons, whose heirs or assigns have from that time to the present derived proportionately as great an income from the estate as has the Dutch church. Leaving the Broadway property out of the calculation we find that the church is drawing at least \$73,000 a year in ground rent from its other lots. The total rent then obtained by all the owners from that portion of the old field is \$365,000 a year. That is to say, a number of land owners are permitted by law to levy a tax of \$1,000 a day on the limited number of people doing business on that small spot.

But though recent maps leave out the Broadway lots in indicating the Shoemaker's field, there appears to be no reason for doing so. Broadway is given in the old maps as the western boundary of the tract. The original deed of partition, as recorded in the register's office, distinctly mentions all of the Broadway lots as included in the sixteen acres and assigns them to John Harberdinck. They extended along Broadway from Maiden lane a sufficient distance beyond Fulton street to include the Knox building. The two lots bequeathed to the church do not include a tenth part of the Broadway front. The remainder of it, though now owned by various individuals, must be taken into account in making any estimate of the appreciation of this property in value. The tenth part owned by the church we have found is rented for \$49,000 a year. It is a moderate estimate to put down all of these lots as yielding a ground rent of ten times that, or \$490,000. Add to this the \$365,000 annual rent for property off of Broadway, and we have a total rental of \$855,000 a year derived from this old field. To this must be added the taxes paid by tenants, which, as the buildings are included in the valuation, must yield nearly half as much more. It thus appears that private parties and the city together can obtain over a million dollars a year for permitting a comparatively small number of people to use for business purposes sixteen acres of this island between Ann street and Maiden lane.

The fact that the buildings are included in the present assessment does not militate against this statement, for recent sales have shown that the assessment does not cover

more than half of the value of both building and land at auction sale, and the land is almost invariably worth more than the building. Mr. Corbin agrees, for instance, to put up a building to cost \$200,000 on the lot at Broadway and John street. The interest on this at six per cent is \$12,000, while he contracts to pay \$18,000 a year rent, supposing five per cent on the value of the land. It is entirely safe, then, to assume that the present assessment on houses and lots does not reach an amount equal to the selling value of the land alone.

Taking the revenues of the Randall farm as a basis for calculation, it was recently shown that by a tax levied exclusively on land values the municipality of New York could easily raise a revenue of \$100,000,000 a year without increasing the burden now laid upon the people by rents paid to private owners and taxes directly or indirectly paid to the city. Randall's farm embraced twenty-one acres, thus covering the one hundred and eighty-sixth part of this island below Forty-second street, a portion of the city which at the time of the last census still held two-thirds of our whole population. The shoemaker's field, which is easily capable of bearing a tax of \$1,000,000 a year on land values, contains but sixteen acres, or the two hundred and fortieth part of the territory below Forty-second street. Taking it as a basis it would appear that a revenue of \$240,000,000 annually could be obtained. Such a calculation would, however, be misleading, for unquestionably the rental value of this land is above the average for the territory named. These figures, nevertheless, go to show the moderation of the calculations based on actual results in a portion of the city occupied for both business and residential purposes, and where neither stores nor residences yield rents so high as are paid in other parts of the city.

Neither of the estates described in these articles was selected on account of any special knowledge of its revenues. It is unquestionably the design of all those who control such pieces of property to conceal the facts concerning them. The Sailors' Snug Harbor is compelled by law to make some kind of a report to the city. The one it makes is blind and confusing enough, but it suffices to give at least a basis for calculating annual rents and for making a safe estimate of the steady and enormous increase in land values. In the case of the shoemaker's field the results are even more startling. Less than two centuries ago this property was a vacant swamp outside the city limits, to be had almost for the asking; fifty years ago it was a prize well worth struggling for in the courts; to-day it is yielding in ground rent and taxes a sum amounting to millions of dollars a year. Let us suppose for a moment that the city had retained in its possession this and the adjacent property. Such a course would not have prevented its improvement. That fifth part of the property conveyed to the Collegiate church by John Harberdinck's invalid will is as thoroughly improved as the portions divided up among individuals. At least one contract to erect a building costing \$200,000 on one of these lots has been made by a shrewd business man within a few years. The conditions arising from practical public ownership would have given a more secure tenure than the twenty-one years' lease taken by Austin Corbin for the lot at the corner of Broadway and John street. In the other case the builder would have had a guarantee of perpetual possession, provided he continued to pay a tax no greater than that he will pay to the Collegiate church and the city combined. The municipality would have had, however, the benefit of the vast sums now paid to private individuals for the privilege of occupying this ground. It could, without encountering any enormous expense, have widened John, Fulton, Nassau, Ann and other streets. It could have covered these and all other streets with perfect pavements, erected public buildings wherever they were needed, instead of paying heavy rents to individuals as it now does, and such a great public improvement as the Brooklyn bridge could have been readily built out of the annual surplus without placing a mortgage on the industry and enterprise of the future in the shape of a public debt.

It must be plain to the dullest comprehension that all of this would have been easily possible had the citizens asserted the doctrine of the land for the people while the municipality was still possessed of vast tracts of common land on this island. The past is irrevocable, but the future is in our own hands. The increase in land values continues at an accelerated pace, and it will be vastly greater during the coming century than it has been during the past two hundred years. The question is, shall this generation go on repeating the blunder of the past, or will it, even at this late day, secure to the people the values that their mere presence on this island creates. This is the issue of present politics that dwarfs all others into insignificance, and no one who comprehends all that such a change assures can have any hesitation in giving his best energies to assist in bringing it about. Happily the workmen, whose wits have never been befogged by a false system of political economy, who have personally experienced the abomination of overcrowding, while they see thousands of acres lying unused and vacant within the city limits, have found and declared the truth; but the reform that they propose will not benefit only those technically called workmen. Every renter in this city has an equal interest in bringing about a change that will multiply homes, cheapen the rent of dwellings, promote building and other industries, and which, though it will not lower the ground rents of business places, will divert these rents from private pockets to the municipal treasury to be used in works of public utility for the common benefit. Let the retail storekeepers, especially, think what it would mean to them to have established a system that would set an army of men to work in building up the waste places of New York, and thus give an impulse to every trade in the city.

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
31 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50, six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the post office, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers at every post office in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1887.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Friday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

MR. PARNELL AND THE PHOENIX PARK ASSASSINATIONS.

There can be no doubt that in the letter it has printed as showing Mr. Parnell's condemnation of the assassination of Cavendish and Burke the London Times has been deceived by a forgery of the same kind as that of the Morey letter which created so much excitement here toward the close of the Garfield-Hancock campaign. It has fallen readily into the trap because the notion that the Irish parliamentary leaders really sympathize with all Irish "outrages" is firmly rooted in the minds of the class of Englishmen which the Times represents. Yet for all its prejudices the Times is conducted on honorable principles, and will satisfy its traditions if it does not do what it can to expose the forgery as soon as it shall be convinced that it has been imposed upon.

Mr. Parnell is not only too cautious a man to write such a letter, but there is nothing in his career that, outside of that class of Englishmen to whose anti-Irish prejudices nothing is incredible, would give color to the idea that he sympathized with assassination. And I have personal reasons for believing that, excluding the relatives of the murdered officials, there was no man in the three kingdoms more deeply shocked and horrified by these assassinations than Mr. Parnell. It so happened that it was through me that the first intelligence of these assassinations reached him, and I had an opportunity of seeing him under conditions in which only the most consummate actor could have concealed his real feelings.

I was at that time on the other side of the Atlantic as correspondent of the *Irish World*, and receiving a cable dispatch from Patrick Ford asking me to meet Davitt immediately on his release. I went from Dublin to London, and in company with Mr. Sexton and some others of the Irish party met Davitt, who was escorted from Portland prison by Messrs. Parnell and Dillon, at the railway station. It was nearly 11 o'clock when I said good night to Mr. Davitt and the little party that had assembled to greet him at the Westminster hotel, and went to the house of the friend in South Kensington with whom I was staying. It may seem strange to an American, but though Cavendish and Burke had been there nearly three hours dead, and Dublin was convulsed with excitement, the general public of London, and even men so vitally interested as the Irish leaders, knew nothing of what had occurred. The London newspapers publish no Sunday editions. On Saturday nights their offices are deserted, and there is no machinery for getting out extras with unexpected news, no matter what its importance, and if telegrams had been sent to the Irish members they were probably delayed by the postoffice department. But early in the extremely early English summer morning, when the great city is sound asleep than in any other part of the day, I was aroused by a telegraph messenger bringing me a private dispatch from Dr. Kelly, then of Rutland square, Dublin, but now of Lexington avenue, New York, apprising me of the tragedy. I immediately made what haste I could (for at that hour no public conveyance was to be had), to the Westminster hotel, and waking Davitt up, showed him the telegram. Springing up with intense emotion he at once sent for Messrs. Dillon and Parnell. All three, as well as other members of the Irish party who were subsequently sent for, were deeply pained and grieved at the news. Davitt seemed so much "cut up" by it that I really felt for him, but the man who seemed stirred the most was Parnell—ordinarily the most undemonstrative of human beings—and on the first impulse he talked of immediately resigning and leaving public life forever. There could be no question of the real feelings of these men, and especially of Mr. Parnell. It is not that there was any personal sympathy with Burke, who had made himself thoroughly hated by patriotic Irishmen, but there was personal sympathy with Lord Cavendish, who had just arrived in Ireland and had done nothing to offend Irish sentiment. His appointment, moreover, to take the place of the justly hated Forster, accompanied as it was with the release of the Irish members from Kilmainham and of Davitt from Portland, was deemed the holding out of the olive branch by the Gladstone government—the dawn for Ireland of a better day. And to this the knives that flashed in Phoenix Park gave terrible answer. At a single unexpected blow Parnell's plans were shattered. To him it was not merely two high officials who were stabbed to death in Phoenix Park, but a great policy and a high hope.

I had at that time good opportunities for judging of Irish feeling, and I feel confident that the unanimous expression of

horror and regret which the Phoenix park assassinations provoked in Ireland, as well as from Irishmen in other parts of the world, was thoroughly genuine. Had these assassinations happened a week or two earlier; had it been Forster and Burke that were slain, instead of Cavendish and Burke, it would have been different; but to the Irish people these assassinations, happening as they did, seemed like the slaughter of the bearer of a flag of truce—the slaying of the messenger of good tidings.

Had Mr. Gladstone been wise enough and strong enough to trust this feeling; had he refused to hold the Irish people responsible for what was not their act, and gone on in generous confidence with that policy of substituting conciliation for coercion, toward which he had made the first steps, years of bitterness might have been saved. But he was not wise enough or strong enough to resist the frantic English demand for repressive measures. The old, dreary round of coercion was entered upon again, and the sentiment of grief and abhorrence which had swept over Ireland with the news of the Phoenix park assassinations was quickly forgotten in intensified hatred of English oppression.

The Irish were right in using their strength to bring back the tories into power. No tory government could have gone to the same lengths in attempting to coerce Ireland as did Mr. Gladstone and his liberals. For to tory coercion there is the opposition of the English liberals, but to liberal coercion there was none—or, rather, there was but little, for to the honor of such men as Joseph Cowen and the little knot of English democrats, it should always be remembered that they stood as firmly against liberal coercion as against tory coercion. But the personal weight of Mr. Gladstone, the unquestioning confidence which he has inspired among the great body of British liberals, gave overwhelming support to any measure of coercion that he proposed.

Five years ago, when all the wonderful talents and peerless influence of the great English leader were being prostituted to trample down the rightful aspirations of the Irish people, it seemed to me that Mr. Gladstone had lived too long for his future fame, and that if his public career had closed in the victory that followed his magnificent Midlothian campaign his life would have gone down to posterity unsullied by a closing chapter such as that which tarnishes the fame of Burke. But through this chapter Mr. Gladstone has lived, and the good work he is now doing may blot out the memory of it. From the Irish point of view, Saul of Tarsus has become Paul the Apostle. The man who, a little while ago, was endeavoring to govern Ireland by Russian methods, and was sending Irish patriots to jail without trial, and even without specific accusation, is now leading the fight for Irish rights. And in this he is doing more than any other living man could have done, what is, of all things, most to be desired both for Great Britain and for Ireland—he is making a junction between the democracies of the two countries. That at last the great masses of Englishmen begin to see that the cause of Irish liberty is indeed their cause; that at last patriotic Irishmen begin to realize that their struggle is not in reality with the English people, but with a class dominance that oppresses both, is the greatest thing that could have happened for the future, of both Ireland and of Great Britain.

The moment the Irish political question is settled, if only temporarily, that moment the land question will flame up, not in Ireland alone, but in Great Britain as well. This is the bottom of the whole controversy, the objective point of the whole struggle. The long course of English misgovernment of Ireland which is now nearing its end in the triumph of the Irish people, has had for its object the maintenance of that system of slavery which, by making the land of a country the property of a class, enables that class to live in idleness at the expense of the producers of wealth. And the revolt of the Irish people is a social as well as a political revolt. It can stop short of nothing save the restitution of the land of Ireland to the whole Irish people—the recognition in a form adapted to modern civilization of the ancient Irish principle that assured to every citizen a foothold in his native land. Mere political independence will not satisfy Irish grievances. It can do nothing to eradicate poverty, to prevent starvation, to make life easier for the masses of the Irish people. But it will clear the way for the great measure that can accomplish all of these things. And in the struggle for this, Irishmen, Englishmen, Scotchmen and Welshmen will stand together.

HENRY GEORGE.

THE KNIGHTS AND POLITICS.

The *Journal of United Labor*, the official organ of the executive board of the Knights of Labor, in an article in its last number, entitled "Has It Come to Stay?" recognizes the significance of recent local elections as showing the break-up of old political parties, and declares it to be evident that, properly organized and wisely led, the labor party will be irresistible; but adds that unless it strives toward the attainment of some living ideas its success can at best be but temporary.

This is true. Yet the *Journal* seems hardly to realize how necessary it is that the ideas should give rise to the party rather than that the party should select the ideas, since it goes on to declare that "Knights of Labor need not go away from home to get issues to advocate. They have a declaration of principles, any one of which carried out would materially advance the welfare of the human family." It then enumerates those sections of the Knights of Labor platform which demand: (1) the reservation of public land; for actual settlers and the taxing of lands held for speculative purposes; (2) a graduated income tax; (3) the doing away with banks of

issue, and (4) state ownership of railroads, telegraphs and the like.

It would be well for the Knights of Labor in their assemblies to discuss these propositions with a view to political action, and we are glad to see the official journal thus directing attention to them. But the Knights of Labor cannot of themselves make a successful party, nor is it necessary that they should try, since any general measures that would promote their interests as citizens must also commend themselves to other citizens. The formative idea of the Knights of Labor is wider than that of simple trade unionism, in that it aims at uniting all classes of workers, and recognizes the importance of acting upon the general conditions of society. If the order has largely become a congeries of trades unions, sometimes at war with other trades unions, it is because this idea of acting upon general conditions has found no definite expression. But as soon as it does, then the action to carry it out must, of course, pass into the field of open political organization.

What the Knights of Labor, as all other workmen, ought to set themselves to discover is what large measure of legislation they really need. Hitherto what strength of the order has not been devoted to mere trades unionism—to conferences, arbitrations, strikes and boycotts—has been frittered away in demands for such comparatively trivial measures of legislation as the doing away with convict competition, the establishment of bureaus of statistics, the inspection of factories, etc., etc., which, whether good or bad in themselves, can "go nowhere" to the settlement of the great labor question. What is needed to form a rallying point in politics is not a number of little propositions, but one great fundamental principle, so radical and inclusive in its nature that it will carry the little propositions with it or dispense with the need for them.

The change in general conditions which it is most important to the Knights of Labor and all other organized workmen to bring about is that which will make the opportunities for employment abundant, and, consequently, wages high. This, also, is to the interest of unorganized labor, and even to that of the "rat" and the "scab." And no matter how much the employer or the capitalist, driven, as is generally the case, by as keen a competition as exists among workmen, may in his individual dealings desire to lower wages, yet he too wants general conditions in which there shall be abundant opportunity for employment and high wages, for these mean "good times," with business brisk and profitable.

Thus, when it comes to affecting general conditions through political action, the larger interests of all producers—of all who by any exertion of muscle or brain take part in the complex processes by which the wants of society are satisfied—are become identical; and there is no reason why those who aim at carrying certain measures should not welcome to their side, without other distinction, all who are in favor of those measures. This, moreover, is the condition of success.

The root of all labor troubles, the cause of that intense competition for employment which tends to sink wages to the point of a bare living, and of the banding of men together to resist it, is plainly the difficulty that those who have nothing but their labor to sell find in getting employment for it. As is shown more elaborately in a chapter from "Social Problems," reprinted in another column, the cause of this difficulty of finding employment lies in the monopolization of land—the natural means and indispensable condition for the employment of labor.

Of this the masses throughout the United States are widely conscious, and are becoming every day more conscious, and it is already clear that the land question will be the next real political issue. That the *Journal* sees this is evident from the prominence which it gives it in its suggestion of "issues."

But the land plank of the Knights of Labor platform is inadequate. It represents the first vague perception that the ills of which labor is conscious are to be found in our treatment of land, rather than any definite idea of how land is to be opened to labor. It reads:

That the public lands, the heritage of the people, be reserved for actual settlers—not another acre for railroads or speculators; and that all lands now held for speculative purposes be taxed to their full value.

Considering that our public domain is all but gone, the first part of this plank proposes what would be only a locking of the stable door after the horse had been stolen, even if all experience did not show that it is in practice impossible to prevent speculators from getting possession of land so long as they find great profits in it. The second part is of more importance. To tax lands held for speculation even as heavily as lands in use, would at present throw open considerable quantities of land. But it would not prevent speculation, since speculators could in many cases pay that tax and still profit by the enormous increase in land values which comes with rapidly increasing population.

And even if it be intended to tax land held for speculative purposes up to its full value, so as to prevent the holding of land unused, this could not be a final settlement of the question nor a restoration to the people of their heritage. It would still leave to individuals and corporations the enormous incomes drawn from land which is not held for speculation, but put to use. And as population increased and land values augmented, while more and more land was held for other than speculative purposes, labor would find itself in as bad a condition as ever. There is in Ireland, for example, little or no land held for speculative purposes. Moreover, there is an indefiniteness about such a proposition that would prevent any law based on it from being carried out. How is it to be determined whether land is being held for speculative purposes or not? Any pretense

of use or occupancy—a few cattle, a little scratching of soil, a bit of a shanty—would be sufficient to give excuse for evasion.

The only way to really prevent speculation in land is to tax land values, irrespective of improvements, and to tax them so heavily as to take the full rental value for public use. In this way not only would speculation in land be made unprofitable, but the enormous values which the growth of society gives to land held for other than speculative purposes could be taken for the use of the whole people. And the fight might as well be made from the beginning upon this proposition as upon anything which merely squints at it. If to do so would be to excite more opposition, so also would it be to arouse stronger support.

No one understands all this better than the keen and progressive minds in the ranks of the knights themselves.

It is in the assemblies of the Knights of Labor and in the Central labor unions that workmen have found opportunities for the discussion of social questions and the necessary foundation for beginning political action, as the working farmers are beginning to find in their wheels, granges and alliances. But as we said last week, the impulse as it spreads must bring into cohesion men of all vocations, and weld them into a party which will probably take for itself some name less subject to narrow interpretations than that of labor party—a party which it is already clear will have for its definite purpose the assurance to all the people of their natural and equal rights.

In the mean time we are glad to see the organ of the knights urging the discussion of principles, which is, after all, the great means of promoting intelligent political action.

THE LESSON OF THE ELEVATED ROADS.

The history, printed in another column, of the marvelous development of land values in Harlem under the stimulus of the present imperfect rapid transit system, is one which well illustrates the manner in which, under existing social conditions, every improved process of production tends to the exclusive enrichment of a single privileged class. Magnificent as has been the spoil which the elevated roads have garnered for their promoters and stockholders, it falls short by scores of millions of dollars of the immense wealth which the silent inexorable working of economic law has poured into the laps of the fortunate owners of Harlem lands. The poor man's village has been transformed into the rich man's suburb; the lofty flat house has replaced the modest cottage; the rental of \$12 a month has swelled to one of \$1,500 a year; a limited number of speculators have become millionaires, and the men of moderate means, who fondly dreamed that rapid transit would open up to them a region of comfortable low priced homes, have had a rude awakening.

So will it ever be as long as men consent to surrender to a favored few the privilege of monopoly in land. Let a road be constructed to-morrow which shall whirl its passengers to the upper end of Westchester county within thirty minutes, and the chief effect would be seen in a portentous rise in Westchester building lots. Let a new industry be introduced, employing thousands of laborers and clerks, and within a limited time rents would be higher and wages as low as ever. For the one thing in which absolute monopoly is possible is land, and the man who can forbid his fellows to work or live upon the special spot where alone working and living are possible to them, can and will extract from them the uttermost farthing that they can pay and still continue to live and work.

THAT was a strange spectacle, the fining of forty odd business men at the bar of a criminal court in this city for selling oleomargarine, which is pronounced by leading chemists to be healthy food. This was the culmination of a long conflict between two classes of tradesmen, butter dealers and oleomargarine dealers. A law prohibiting the coloring of oleomargarine so as to resemble butter was procured by the butter dealers. In some states they required it to be colored pink and in others green. How effective to destroy the oleomargarine trade such laws must be any one can realize by imagining the butter dish on his table to contain a pink, green or white substance. The New York law was contested and sustained, with the result of bringing to the criminal bar a large number of men whose offense was that their manufacture was a competitor of factory butter, and to destroy great values invested in oleomargarine establishments. Oleomargarine cannot compete with good dairy butter. It is an inferior article. But it can and did compete with factory butter, some of the grades of which are not only inferior to oleomargarine, but positively unhealthy; hence the laws against it. It is noticeable that none of the persistent sticklers for "vested interests" have anything to say for "vested interests" in the oleomargarine business which have been so ruthlessly destroyed. It makes a great difference, it seems, whether "vested interests" are in a legitimate business or a monopoly.

THERE was more than he intended in Assemblyman Crosby's objection to the labor holiday bill that labor ought to have no holiday until it is free. With the bigotry and ignorance that characterize his class, he intended to sneer at labor organizations, which, in imitation of stock exchanges, medical societies, lawyers' trade unions, and so on, undertake to regulate the supply and price of labor by association; but his words apply with greater force a thousand fold to the power over labor of his own class. By the appropriation of land values to their own use a portion of the community holds the rest in bondage, since man without land is as helpless as a fish in the air. So long as that condition

continues labor cannot be free, and, if the Crosbys are to have their way, never will be.

READERS of recent articles in THE STANDARD relative to business men will see that the labor question is of interest to them as well as to the class denominated workmen. The labor question is a question of wages and interest against rent, of work against monopoly. The income of the average business man is in part wages and in part interest. In the matter of wages he is interested equally with the man he hires; in the matter of interest he is still further interested, for interest falls as wages do. As with the man he hires, rent is his enemy, not only to the extent of the rent he pays, but to the extent that increasing rent diminishes opportunities for business and restricts the purchasing power of his customers. Every business man will recognize this truth, that the business man who has not some special advantage over business men in general is in a bad way. He is all the time under the harrow, and liable at any time to descend from employer to employee, as so many have before him. What does he propose to do about it?

The story of life in Dakota, as given in the columns of THE STANDARD this week, sheds a strong light upon the processes of wealth-getting in vogue in our western empire. There, as here, fortune comes to him who has the wit and foresight to seize upon the natural sources of production, and hold them until a gathering population shall compete for the privilege of using them.

A REV. DR. STUFFENS telegraphs from Rome to the *Catholic News* that the pope has decided not to abolish the Knights of Labor; but that "if the Knights identify themselves with theories now being disseminated by certain agitators this decision in their favor will be revoked"—probably by the Rev. Dr. Stiffins.

THE New York *Tribune* is approving the theory of evolution by developing a rudimentary mind under the influence of the environment. In a half sensible kind of a way the *Tribune* is actually beginning to think.

"Land is high," remarks the *Tribune*, speaking of this city, "and the tendency is to make it higher." And then the thought process begins. The *Tribune* sees a vast multitude of citizens eager for the privilege of using land; it sees a limited number of persons preventing them from doing so; it sees land values soaring skyward; and combining these inductions into a theory or argument it delivers itself of the opinion that if land owners aren't pretty careful they will make New Yorkers tired of trying to live in New York and thus cause land values to take a drop again for want of competition. Here is what it says:

If this market is to be sustained, more respect must be paid by landlords to the fact that not every resident of New York is a millionaire. The number of persons who can afford to pay rentals of over \$1,200 is comparatively small. . . . Unless something is done to provide homes for tenants who can pay from \$600 to \$1,000 rent within an hour's reach of their place of business, the real estate market, in the opinion of prudent and observant men, is likely to take a precipitate fall that will be very injurious to New York. The date of this misfortune is being hurried by labor troubles. These have recently been so general that builders are becoming discouraged, and they burden the situation with a problem that does not admit a ready solution. . . . So much depends, in a business sense, upon keeping the real estate market firm, moderate and active that every taxpayer should feel a keen interest in averting the dangers to it that arise from foolish speculation and in supporting all those municipal improvements likely to strengthen it.

As the *Tribune's* rudimentary mind develops into a true thinking apparatus it will discover that the reason for the progression of a horse and cart is not because of the cart pushing the horse. Simultaneously it will learn that builders are not discouraged because of labor troubles, but that labor troubles arise because building and other productive operations are discouraged. As the process of evolution advances, and its power of observing and co-ordinating phenomena increases, it will observe that builders can't build without land to build on, and that the reason they can't get land to build on is because of that very "firmness" of the real estate market that it is so anxious to see maintained. And then it will begin to ask indignantly by what right a few individuals presume to deprive their fellow men of that equal right of access to the raw material of nature without which capital and labor are as powerless as a lever without a fulcrum.

THE *Mail and Express* lately quoted with approval a suggestion by Dr. L. L. Seaman, a gentleman who has devoted much time and thought to penal questions, "that the male convicts in the penitentiary should be brought over to New York in gangs and set to work on city improvements. 'Why,' says Dr. Seaman, 'should not the gangs of brawny stonecutters and metal workers, who deplete the public treasury with their sterile toil on the island, take in hand the construction of the great system of docks and quays which one day is to engirdle the entire water front of the city? Is there nothing to engage the latent energies of these costly excrecences of our civilization in the projected opening of the Harlem river as the great commercial enterprise of the future? There are quarries of building stone all about us waiting for the drill and blast and tool man. Absolutely cut loose from the octopus of political maladministration, what hinders the gradual development of a water front under the regulated labor of convicts, which shall provide for the inflowing commerce of both hemispheres?'

What, indeed? There is, as Dr. Seaman says, no lack of the natural elements of production in and around this city, and no lack of demand for the completed products. There are not only quarries of building stone "waiting for the drill and blast and tool man," and a vast river front lacking development, but there are also a few building lots (say one-half the total area of the city, or thereabouts) waiting for the

stone and other materials to be used on them. There is not only a mighty commerce demanding an improved water front, but also a mighty population demanding houses to live in. There are rapid transit roads to be built, bridges to be erected, gas mains and electric wires to be laid—and dozens of things to be done. Why should not our convicts be "cut loose from the octopus of political maladministration," and set to work at all this? The sure way to get work would then be to become a convict; workmen would compete among themselves for the privilege of conviction; and the souls of the *Mail and Express* and Dr. Seaman would be made glad within them by an unmistakable improvement in the character, conduct and conversation of the convict class, which would be a great blessing and an irrefutable evidence of the superiority of the system.

Of course there is an alternative. Matters might be so arranged that men should have the privilege of going to work at the stone quarries and the water front and the vacant lots and all the rest of it, without going through the primal formality of conviction. But neither the *Mail and Express* nor Dr. Seaman are at all likely to accept this alternative, for the simple reason that along with the decrease in the number of convicts there would come a decrease in the incomes of not a few "Christian" churches and of a great many of our best families.

ARCHBISHOP CORRIGAN is rapidly growing worse. The priests of the diocese are being bulldozed to sign an amended excommunication of "His Grace," and a number of German monks have been inveigled and coerced into signing another similar paper in English, a language which to most of them is as a foreign tongue.

We print these documents in another column, where will also be found a threatening letter addressed by the archbishop to the editor and the proprietor of the *Catholic Herald*, in which they are warned of peril from his ecclesiastical thunders if they continue to criticise his course. No wonder that "His Grace" was emphatic even to underscoring that his threat should be considered private and not to be published. Only one thing is wanting to make the archiepiscopal epistle perfect in its way, and that is a postscript—BURN THIS LETTER.

Since the editor of the *Catholic Examiner* has been temerarious enough to say in his last issue that we have too many popes in this country, surely some too too unutterably awful thing must speedily happen to him.

The attention of our friends is called to the list of land and labor tracts printed in our advertising columns. They put within the reach of all an efficient means of attracting attention to the greatest reforms.

MEN AND WOMEN.

*Elder F. W. Evans of the Shaker settlement at New Lebanon, N. Y., is a staunch advocate of the common rights to land. He says that the claim to property in land is "a doctrine of devils; upon it Babylon stands." He quotes Jefferson: "Land belongs to man only in usufruct" and says that "when this primal truth shall be universally recognized, the whole landed system of the world shall be abolished."

Rev. Charles P. McCarthy of this city visited Mauch Chunk, Pa., at the close of last week and made several stirring speeches in behalf of appropriating land values for public purposes. One meeting was restricted to the general public, another was restricted to Knights of Labor, and another to miners, each of which meetings was largely attended and a lively interest was awakened in the land question.

James J. Fay of Rutland, Vt., an enthusiastic advocate of the principle of "the land for the people," and for some time master workman of the Knights of Labor, has been elected president of his village against a candidate receiving the combined support of the republican and democratic machines.

An Utterance of Cardinal Gibbons.

In the full report of Cardinal Gibbons' report to the holy see on the subject of the Knights of Labor appears a paragraph not hitherto published in any English translation of the report. Speaking of the injury likely to be inflicted on the church by a determination to array her forces in opposition to popular rights, the cardinal refers for illustration to the case of Dr. McElhinn, and says:

"We have lately seen the sorrowful and menacing confusion which was caused by the condemnation inflicted, for the maintenance of discipline, by an archbishop upon a single priest; a condemnation which the archbishop believed to be just and necessary, but which struck a priest who was regarded as a friend of the people. Now, if the consequences to the interests of the church from the condemnation of a single priest were so deplorable because that priest was regarded as the friend of the people, what will not be the consequences to fear from a condemnation which shall strike directly at the people themselves in the exercise of what they believe to be their legitimate rights?"

What Happened at a Meeting of the Republican County Committee.

Daily Paper.
Grimes—What did you say?
Redmond—Didn't you hear me?
Grimes—Who's a liar?
Redmond—You are.
Grimes—You are a — liar!
Redmond—You are a — liar!
Grimes (raising his fists)—Ah!
Redmond (raising his fists)—Let's see you!
Grimes—Don't you call me a liar!
Redmond—Don't you call me a liar!
Grimes—Now, Redmond.
Redmond—Grimes, what's the matter with you anyhow?
Grimes—That's all right.
Redmond—All right.
Several members of the Union league, who were looking on expecting a knock-out, were disappointed.

A New Labor Paper.

Mr. J. N. Bogert, an indefatigable gatherer of local labor news, has begun the publication of the *Local*, a weekly newspaper which is intended to give the social news of the labor movement in New York. The columns of the opening number teem with pleasant chat about people and events. Mr. Bogert has a large acquaintance with the wage workers of New York, and is well qualified to carry his venture to a success.

THE WEEK.

The scheme for an elevated railway in Broadway has fallen through, and some other system of rapid transit, probably of the grade type, will have the preference. It is a fact worth noting, in considering this question, that the legislature has simply endeavored to learn what would best suit the real estate owners of Broadway and other streets, and has ignored the interests of the immense landless class of citizens, for whose benefit streets are supposed to be maintained and rapid transit systems organized.

The New York state senate has finally passed the bill requiring savings banks to publish the names of depositors who have had \$100 or more to their credit for twenty years, but have not in the meantime been heard from. The benefits which will accrue from such a law are too evident to require demonstration. The opponents of the measure have contented themselves with uttering a few generalities about inquisitorial legislation, and the hardships that might be inflicted on the many people who are trying to save money without the knowledge of disreputable relatives by making deposits at intervals of twenty years. The real reason for the opposition to the bill was that it would diminish the profits of the stockholders in savings banks by forcing them to surrender a lot of money that doesn't belong to them.

Mr. Beckman, the president of the board of aldermen, has been considering the tenement house problem. "It is an open secret," says Mr. Beckman, "that tenements and rookeries have been erected in portions of the city which should have been kept exempt from buildings. In these houses people swarm like ants. The air is fetid, noxious, and the death rate is enormous. The children grow up weak and sickly, making puny men and women. It is proposed to tear down these rookeries, map out a fair area of land in those portions of the city most densely crowded, and construct small parks. These miniature parks shall each have fountains, and be veritable playgrounds for the young. Now the little ones have no place in which to play, nor their parents a spot where they can enjoy a refreshing breathing spell." And with this humane purpose in view Mr. Beckman asks the legislature to appoint a board for the laying out of parks with authority to spend one million of dollars yearly.

Mr. Beckman means well, but he doesn't quite grasp all the elements of the problem he is trying to solve. He doesn't realize that tenement houses by choice, they do it because poverty compels them to; and the tenement houses are built in "parts of the city which should have been exempt from buildings," because landlords can make more money by putting them there. If Mr. Beckman really wants to give the tenement house dwellers the benefit of a park let him spend a million a year in destroying the beauty of Central park—choke up its lakes, deface its statuary, cut down its trees, ruin its drainage, withdraw its policemen—make its neighborhood generally distasteful to the "better classes," and he will be gratified by seeing tenement houses rise in its vicinity by scores. As for his proposed new parks, their only effect will be to raise nearby rents; and the prettier they are the higher the rents will rise. That Mr. Beckman sees this in a confused, puzzle-headed way is evident from his proposal that his new board shall have the power of "adjudging what proportion of the expenses incurred shall be assessed upon property holders who may be directly benefited by the erection of such parks."

Many months ago the legislature of this state enacted that after a certain date no more telegraph poles should be erected in this city, and appointed a subway commission to see that the existing wires were taken down and properly buried. The wires haven't been buried yet to any extent, but the subway commission lives and draws its salary, asserting its usefulness by giving permits for the erection of "temporary" poles and the stringing of new wires thereon. There is a deal of difference between making a law and enforcing it.

The Woodlawn cemetery company bought 400 acres of land in Westchester county from various parties for \$1,000,000, and under the laws of New York has held its property free from even the moderate taxation imposed on other landowners. The company has sold the fee simple of fifty acres for \$1,450,000, has received \$1,162,023 for burial lots, and remains possessed of land now valued at something like \$20,000,000. These facts appear from a report of the cemetery company, made in obedience to a senate resolution. Comment is scarcely necessary.

The legislature of Illinois is still groping in economic darkness. Not content with endeavoring to change the terms of a rack-renting foreign born landlord by the simple process of forcing him to become an American citizen, it is now trying to minimize the greed for wealth by limiting the amount which any person may take by descent or will. Fifteen hundred acres of land, or \$500,000 in money, to a surviving wife, husband, child or corporation is to be the limit of bequest hereafter, and the state is to be the universal residuary legatee.

The value of special legislation of this sort is not to be measured by the number of bills it shows, but by the people of Illinois are aware of something wrong in their social system.

A good deal of platitudes is being printed about the unfortunate Boston women who allowed themselves to be persuaded into depositing their money with Mrs. Howe, a "woman banker," by the promises of interest at the rate of ninety or one hundred per cent. Comparisons are made between Mrs. Howe and Mr. Ferdinand Ward; and the moral pointed in both cases is that the desire for wealth has somehow a stupefying influence, making its victims blind to obvious facts and inferences. Any sane man or woman, it is said, might have known that neither Ferdinand Ward nor Mrs. Howe could honestly earn the extravagant profits they promised; ergo, to invest money with either of them showed a species of insanity on the part of the depositor.

This is a kind of argument that, starting from correct premises, reaches a false and illogical conclusion. The business men who trusted their money with Ward were sane enough and shrewd enough. Their only mistake was that they assumed Ward to be one kind of a swindler instead of another. They imagined him to have special facilities for cheating the United States government, and invested their money on the faith that he would exercise them; whereas the only facilities Ward possessed were facilities for making his dupes believe that he was going to steal for their benefit. It is just barely possible that Mrs. Howe's victims were not essentially fools, but only unlicky people who applied perfectly trustworthy business principles to a case which those principles accidentally failed to fit.

but should be appropriated by the men who hired the men, women and children who made the cloth. This system, humorously called "protection to American labor," has been in operation for a good many years, with the gratifying result of making American citizens perform an immense number of extra days' work, under penalty of having no cloth to cover themselves with.

But the system has received a shock; not a death blow by any means, but a shock. A cunning detective, sent abroad by the authorities to look into things in general, reports that the unprincipled foreigners who hire the pauper labor of Europe to make cloth for them are actually descending to the meanness of lying, and backing up their lies with false oaths. They are sending cloth here that should properly sell for the labor on four pairs of shoes, and telling a confiding United States government that it's only worth the labor on two pairs. So says Special Treasury Agent L. M. Montgomery in a recent report from Aix-la-Chapelle, in Germany. And the consequences are direful. The American workman is getting his cloth without doing quite as many days' work for it as he ought to do. The men who hire American men, women and children to make cloth for them are not getting it. It would be for the cloth as they would like to, and the contractors and other governmental necessities are left a little, just a very little, short. Altogether a very sad condition of affairs.

Really it is astonishing how ready men are to lie when they can make money by it—in Europe.

On Saturday last eight English women arrived at Boston from England under contract to work in a Providence mill. The collector made a pretence of enforcing the law against the importation of contract labor, but finally allowed the women to land, the employer explaining that they were skilled in a special kind of work which nobody in this country could do.

Protection for people who live by other people's work is one thing, and protection for people who live by working themselves is quite another. It would be rather difficult to import a case of fabrics cut free on the ground that they were better made and finished than domestic goods.

Years and years ago a Mexican official, probably now dead, gone and forgotten, wrote his name and stuck some wax on a piece of paper or parchment certifying that thereafter, as grass should grow and water run, Charles Beaubien and Guadalupe Miranda, their heirs or assigns, should have dominion over 2,680 square miles of territory, with full authority to say who should live and work there, and on what terms they should enjoy those privileges. And on Monday last the supreme court of the United States decided that the names being properly written, the wax duly stamped and all other accessories in order, the assignees of Beaubien and Miranda, to wit: The Maxwell land grant company, the Denver and Rio Grande railway company, the Pueblo and Arkansas Valley railroad company and the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe company shall have dominion accordingly, with the right to levy such taxes as they please on the inhabitants of those parts of Colorado and New Mexico comprised within the limits of the 2,680 square miles aforesaid.

Go west, young man, go west!

Those wicked Irish members are making lots of trouble for the British house of commons, and latterly they have developed a remarkable facility of turning to account the very means hitherto deemed most efficacious for their suppression. A certain Colonel Sanderson having remarked in the course of debate that the home rule Irish members had associated themselves with murderers, and declining to withdraw the statement, Mr. Healy explicitly denounced him as a liar, whereon Mr. Healy was "named" by the speaker and put out. The colonel started anew with his speech, when another Irishman—Mr. Sexton this time—arose and stated his opinion that the colonel was a liar, emphasizing the assertion by a promise to thrash the colonel "when he caught him outside." It was evident that every member of the Irish party intended to follow suit; and sooner than be called a liar eighty odd times in succession, with a looming possibility of receiving eighty odd separate thrashings in the near future, the gallant colonel confessed his falsehood by withdrawing the offensive observation.

But parliament will pass the coercion bill all the same.

Briefly stated, the Irish coercion bill is an enactment that any Irishman who fails to pay his rent promptly, or otherwise disobeys his landlord or his landlord's agent, shall be sentenced to imprisonment at hard labor for six months. And this sentence is to be imposed, not after due trial and proving of the facts before a jury, but at the discretion of a magistrate, generally a landlord himself and always a sympathizer with landlords.

The outbreak of indignation with which the action of the British government has been greeted in this country is creditable to human nature, and shows that American citizens, of whatever descent, have, at bottom, a deep seated hatred of tyranny and injustice. Whether it is altogether consistent or not is another question, and a question worth considering.

Right here in New York city there are tens of thousands of tenants, rack-rented to the limits of human endurance, and beyond it. Suppose that these tenants, organizing together, should unanimously refuse to pay their rent. Suppose that they should resist dispossession warrants by barricading their doors, by pulling down staircases, by hustling and impeding the officers of the law; suppose that they should boycott every man or woman who consented to pay any rent, refusing to speak with them, to work for them, to buy from them, to ride with them in public conveyances, to have anything whatever to do with them; suppose that the clergy of New York should support them in this sort of conduct. Would the Kellys and Haverrys and Cockshuts be found running on their side, placing them, addressing meetings on their behalf, providing funds for their support? Would the press of the country be unanimous in approval? If they would, all right, and the sooner the rack-rented tenants of America open the ball the better. But on the whole we incline to think that the only result of such a movement would be an overcrowding of the penitentiary and workhouses and a series of newspaper editorials denouncing anarchical ideas and counseling the tenants to move on a couple of thousand miles or so—there's plenty of room for them out west.

After all, there is a great deal of human nature in humanity. We all have a keen perception of the mote in the eye of Russia; the American appreciates the horrible evils of English landlordism in Ireland, and the Englishman is not slow to retort on us with a *quoque*; it's the next house that is cursed with malaria and mosquitoes; and to say that anything is wrong right here and now is a crime against civilization. All things considered, the rack-rented tenantry of New York had better wait awhile.

Should the Labor Party Exist?

The literary society of the Young Men's Christian association will meet the Lyceum Society of Philadelphia in Association hall, corner of Fourth avenue and Twenty-third street, on Tuesday evening, April 26, to discuss the question as to whether "the existence of a distinctive labor party be of benefit to the country?" Supreme Court Justice John R. Brady will decide the debate. The discussion is expected to be spirited.

THE WEEK IN WALL STREET.

Slight as it was the \$375,000 increase in reserve last week showed that the long expected return of money to eastern financial centers is about to set in. The actual increase in currency was \$2,000,000, but the perceptible decrease in specie, resulting from the heavy customs requirements, brought the net increase down to \$375,000. With increased funds, on which to speculate, and the lower interest rates consequent, may be expected greater activity in the market and probable higher prices. This case in the monetary situation, the still favorable reports of railroad earnings and the efforts of large holders to keep the upward ball in motion are the principal reasons given by the commission houses for their advice to customers to purchase with every drop of a point or two.

The upward tendency has met and will continue to meet with set backs, as with every advance, the cliques will sell large blocks of stocks. Reading has been the leader in the market and has accumulated several positions of the Pennsylvania, the Lehigh Valley, the Reading and Jersey Central. These four roads are together powerful enough to control the anthracite coal trade of the country, and thus to increase their incomes from this traffic. President Corbin of the Reading has estimated that one dollar per ton can be saved in marketing anthracite. This, on 34,000,000 tons, is a tremendous item, and when to this decrease in the cost of mining and marketing coal is added the increase of fifty cents per ton, the result is a gain of \$1,700,000.

We begin to understand why all the coal stocks have been strong at advances, and why Reading, the largest coal road in the country, is the strongest of all. Then, again, the close alliance or rather the identity of control, between Reading and Jersey Central is said to have thrown in the hands of the former the control of the river front on the Jersey shore. Mr. Corbin is pursuing a peace policy with the Pennsylvania company, the result of which is that Mr. Garrett of the Baltimore and Ohio says that he is going to take the Pennsylvania for these roads for an entrance into New York, but that, if necessary, he will build a line across New Jersey and find an entrance of his own. This effectively disposes of the great Baltimore and Ohio deal that was agitating the street a few weeks ago, and puts Mr. Garrett where he was previous to the reported combination with Richmond Terminal and Reading. This new-born harmony between the Pennsylvania and Reading will lead to greater economy in the operation of both roads.

Mr. Converse is a stickler for economy, and great changes in management always follow his election to the presidency of a railroad. Instead of starting his passenger trains from the same cities at the same time and running a neck and neck race to their destination the Pennsylvania and the Reading trains are to alternate and divide the traffic. This will serve to reduce the number of passenger trains on each road without lessening the income of either. The Reading has notified the lessees of its collieries that they can load in Pennsylvania cars for shipment over the Pennsylvania lines. This permission is a practical annulment of the clause in these leases requiring all shipments to be made over the Reading road.

The interstate commerce law has given strength to both Pacific Mail and Canadian Pacific stocks. It was supposed that the fourth section would throw a heavy traffic of Pacific coast products over these outside routes, but the wool growers of California and producers and business men of that section generally are clamoring for its temporary suspension, and as the suspension has been refused, the stocks are falling. The fourth section of the law is so worded that the tariff authorities can practically decide what the tariff will be on any article, and what stocks will be affected. The Ohio wool growers object to any modification or suspension of the clause, they finding in the law as much of a bonanza almost as a prohibitory wool tariff law would give them.

Should the commission hold the transcontinental roads to its requirements the earnings of the outside lines would increase and their stock would advance; but should it determine to temporarily suspend its operation in favor of these roads, their stocks would advance while the others would decline. Again, a railroad whose traffic is injured by the law may petition the court for a receiver, and while in bankruptcy it will thus earn more money than if kept out of the hands of the court. It has long been suspected that some of our federal judges are owned, body and soul, by the corporations, and it is a very easy thing to change a president or general manager of a railroad into a receiver and in this way allow the road to defy the law. Beyond this is a suspicion that the tariff authorities are practically decided on by the different pools, at the expense of the railroads, can now be made just as well by the commission at the expense of the government. Whichever way it may turn the railroads are likely to come out ahead. The clauses which favor their interests they will make so obnoxious to the traveling and shipping public that the people will ask for their repeal. At any rate, they can follow their old method in many instances until complaint is made by the persons aggrieved, and then they may discover that the regulation of the tariff of 140,000 miles of railroad is too big a job for a commission to undertake. But the law is a step in the right direction, and may lead to the people later on to assume full control.

The struggle for the control of Broadway has shown that a majority of the property owners are opposed to an elevated road, and that a great portion of this opposition can be enlisted in favor of the arcade scheme as being the better of two evils. The fact is, they feel certain they are bound to endure Manhattan elevated stock has been in demand because it is believed the new rapid transit system will eventually come under the control of Gould and Field.

The Montague street (Brooklyn) cable company are to pay \$10,000 a year to Mr. Pierpont for the privilege of passing over about two blocks of that street. This is a glaring instance of a tax on capital, levied for the benefit of a private person. Mr. Pierpont loses nothing if his property is not injured, and does he contribute anything in exchange for this tremendous tax, yet the company must pay him every year the equivalent of 200,000 fares for his consent to pass through a street that has been used for twenty years as a public highway.

Reports of fortunes being made in western land speculation still come in. Kansas City business sites are selling for \$6,000 a front foot, while the real estate boomer seems to be at work in every town and city from the Mississippi to the Pacific coast. The New York *Daily Commercial Advertiser*, a paper devoted to trade interests, gives, in a recent edition, a scathing rebuke to these land speculators, and blames them for disturbing the distribution of wealth and crippling trade by raising the price of land so high that business cannot be transacted profitably.

The grocery and dry goods trades are reported dull, while iron production is very unsteady. The iron men seem to think the interstate commerce act is the cause, and not the increased price of coal on one hand and a decreased demand resulting from land speculation on the other.

Government bonds, though rather dull, are very firm, and with renewed activity will go higher. Already printed interviews with prominent legislators show that the opposition to have the government buy its own bonds in open market, persons acquainted with the situation that only organized effort can procure.

DR. M'GLYNN.

THOUGHTFUL CATHOLICS STEADILY RAL-
LYING TO HIS SUPPORT.A Diamond-Studded Chalice for Dr. Curran
—The Brooklyn Meeting—St. Stephen's Parishioners Will Stand by the Soggarth Aroon.

Among the events of the week marking the drift of public opinion on the persecution of the priestly sympathizers with Dr. McGlynn was the presentation to Dr. Curran, by the teachers and ex-teachers of St. Stephen's church, of a beautiful golden chalice, set with rubies and diamonds. The presentation took place at the house of Miss Byrne, 665 Second avenue, Mr. James O'Reilly accompanying the gift with a brief address.

Dr. Curran, in his response, reaffirmed his opinion that Dr. McGlynn had made no mistake in his theology, and insisted that he himself had been guilty of no contumacy in supporting him. He took his stand by Dr. McGlynn, knowing full well that he would never wrongfully oppose any proper authority. "Dr. McGlynn," said Dr. Curran, "is suffering now, but the time will come when he will be more sanctified than ever."

THE BROOKLYN MEETING.

Repudiating Any Action Which Looks to
Interference in Politics.

THURSDAY, April 14.—Odd Fellows' hall, Brooklyn, was packed by the Catholic men and women who sympathized with Dr. McGlynn in the outrage which had been perpetrated upon him by the archbishop of New York and the castle Catholic end of the priesthood of his diocese. Among those present were: John J. Clancy, ex-member of the board of education; John J. Rafferty, S. P. Ellisworth, P. F. Delaney, John McMackin of this city; James Rordan, Michael J. Kelly, George Smith, George McVeey, secretary of the workmen's state assembly; Richard F. Caffrey, John J. Bealin, James P. Archibald, Richard Hourigan, Thomas S. Delaney, Patrick Fagan, Thomas P. Gill, James J. Gahan, M. O'Connell and Bernard McQuade. The temper of the meeting was unmistakable, as will be seen by the following resolutions, which were adopted with a cheer that almost shook off the roof of the building:

"Resolved, In mass meeting assembled, that we uphold the land doctrine of the party of united labor, and insist that its introduction into the laws of our country will do more to abolish poverty and its favorite child, vice, from our land than any of the alleged principles that are now being urged by the office seeking politicians and political paupers and thieves of the two old parties.

"Resolved, That we affirm, not only the entire morality of the doctrine, but also its absolute antagonism to immorality and vice.

"Resolved, That we deny emphatically the right of any foreign tribunal in church or state to interfere directly or indirectly with the politics of this country.

"Resolved, That we approve of the manner in which the parishioners of St. Stephen's church have expressed their opposition to, and condemnation of, the action of the archbishop of New York by refusing to contribute out of their hard earnings money to the support of men who are, perhaps thoughtlessly or ignorantly, opposed to a man who has done more to elevate and improve the condition of his fellow men than the archbishop and all his friends will ever be able to do unless they regret their errors, and undo the evil they have done.

"Resolved, That we urge the consideration of the plan adopted by the parishioners of St. Stephen's upon the attention of the parishioners of all the churches of the diocese of New York, to the end that the men now in authority may be forced, through their pockets, to give that thought to the needs of the toilers and producers which they have heretofore shamelessly neglected to do.

"Resolved, That we uphold and indorse the action of Dr. McGlynn and tender him our thanks for his action, and for his courageous action in proving true to his convictions in the face of vindictive opposition from the wealthy and powerful.

"Resolved, That the chairman of this meeting be directed to appoint a committee of the citizens of this district to wait upon the bishop of the city of Brooklyn and the archbishop of New York to explain the land doctrines to those gentlemen and request them to think on the subject prayerfully, to the end that when they have arrived at a knowledge of the truth, Rev. Dr. McGlynn may be honorably reinstated in his position as the pastor of St. Stephen's."

James P. Archibald began with a glowing panegyric to Dr. McGlynn, and in the course of his address fired ringing shots at "the O'Donoghue," "Bully" Donnelly, "Tammany" Preston and Archbishop Corrigan. He said in conclusion that if the Lord did not punish Preston in this world he would not forget to do so in the next.

James J. Gahan, after paying a glowing tribute to Father Malone, the patriot who ran up the American flag in times of war, said that the meeting, properly understood, was an anti-coercion meeting. He claimed the same as they do in Ireland, and that is the land for the people. When the archbishop made the charges against the doctor he put forward as his chief defense that he, the son of Irish parents, had come out and identified himself with a movement to give back the land to the people of Ireland. That was his first offense. The man who hailed Dr. McGlynn over the coals was a man trained in the school of reaction. This man acted in obedience to an English clique which had established itself in Rome. It was through this clique that Simon was elevated to position, and acting under their instructions he issued the celebrated circular letter to all the priests in Ireland, commanding them no longer to take part in the agitation of the land for the people. This was the man who was persecuting the doctor. There were 15,000 capitalists in Brooklyn receiving yearly rent amounting to \$4,000,000. If this money, instead of going into the pockets of those land owners, were put into a common fund for keeping the houses of Brooklyn in a proper condition, would it not be clear that the whole expenses of the city would be much less and that the people would be relieved from further taxation? He warned any foreign power, especially Rome, not to interfere in American politics.

Mr. John McMackin was next introduced. He said that if there was any departure from true theology it was the archbishop who was guilty. He characterized him as "this little archbishop whose head is so narrow." Mr. McMackin severely arraigned the politicians who are at the bottom of the scheme, and paid his respects to Preston, Donnelly & Co.

The other speakers were Richard McCaffrey of Greenpoint, John J. Bealin and Dr. Coughlin.

AMONG THE "REBELS."

Dr. McGlynn's Parishioners Will Stand or
Fall with the "Soggarth Aroon."

FRIDAY EVENING, April 15.—After spending holy week in a properly devotional manner, the rebellious parishioners of St. Stephen's appeared again in full force at International hall, Twenty-seventh street. The proceedings were, as usual, opened by Mr. Feeny, who said that the editors of the monopolistic press

—lost to all sense of duty to their Maker, forgetting the season of prayer—had taken advantage of the fact that Dr. McGlynn's parishioners had not met on Good Friday, to parade in their venal sheets that the parishioners had concluded to hold no more meetings; that the threat of excommunication by the archbishop had had its effect; that the committee of thirty-five were quarreling; that Dr. McGlynn had been deserted. All this, Mr. Feeny declared, was false, and came with bad grace from a press that had for the last four months well nigh boycotted all mention of these meetings. The parishioners of St. Stephen's had made a note of the unjust treatment of Dr. McGlynn and his friends by the "dishonest, unreliable" press of New York city. The parishioners were going to hold meetings every Friday, excepting holy days, until the soggarth aroon again appeared before the altar of St. Stephen's and from there blessed them.

The following resolutions, denouncing the action of the archbishop in sending Father Curran to retirement during the last ten days of Lent, were read and adopted:

"Resolved, That we, in mass meeting assembled, indorse the action of the Rev. Dr. Curran and tender him our congratulations for the manly stand he has taken, and ask him in God's name to continue in the same Christian course.

"Resolved, That we condemn the action of Archbishop Corrigan in this respect as unbefitting a Christian minister, whose duty it is to inculcate the Christian doctrine and Christian practices; and be it furthermore

"Resolved, That we denounce the infamous circular calling on the priests of this diocese asking them to subscribe their names, and, therefore, manifest their belief that the statement in that document set forth, that the Rev. Dr. McGlynn is vain and vindictive, as a breach of the command of God—which says: 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor'; and, furthermore, we hold up to the public gaze the Rev. Monsignor Preston, Fathers Lynch and Edwards, the clerical body guard of the archbishop and the arch enemies of our beloved pastor, Rev. Edward McGlynn, and recommend them to the prayerful consideration of the faithful.

"The Rev. Dr. Curran gave notice that in spite of the reports of the press to the contrary the meetings of St. Stephen's parishioners would be continued. Dr. McGlynn would never go to Rome as a suspended priest. Speaking of the secret circular which had been sent around among the pastors for signatures, and which had proved a boomerang for the archbishop, the appearance of one name had surprised him, that of Father Kelly, whom Dr. McGlynn had befriended on more than one occasion.

Speeches were made by Messrs. Moran, McMackin, Steers and Bealin. The audience found vent for its feeling in frequent applause, some of the points eliciting enthusiasm being as follows: "A number of politicians have undoubtedly got into the confidence of some of the heads of the church."

"Events are occurring throughout the country which will show those men that they have made a mistake in striking down one of the friends of the poor." "When they (the hierarchy) resolved among themselves to decapitate this honored pastor they thought that, as before, the breaking down of a man, as a devoted priest, would be looked upon as final—but they have made a mistake." "The doctor was tried, but it was in the gambling dens by men who had piled up enormous wealth which they took from the poor." "Dr. McGlynn was not invited to go to Rome, but he was told to publicly admit that he had sinned and then go to Rome as a criminal."

"The archbishop asserted that the theory was condemned by the church. A bishop in another country preface his pastoral with the remark that he had no right to talk to them on the subject, but said substantially that the land belonged to the people. Questions of land were never made questions of theology." "Those who have signed this document know that it is a lie, and they should be suspended." "The priest who, after signing the circular, would say mass commits a sacrilege." "An archbishop who has an income of \$40,000 a year can keep the church for a few years. Continue doing as you have done and stand by Doctor McGlynn. Remember a priest he is, and a priest he always will be."

Mr. Feeny closed the meeting at half-past 10 o'clock. The parishioners will henceforth meet weekly on Friday in the same hall.

Father Maguire and Other Germans Ad-
dress the Archbishop.

This is published in the New York papers as having been presented to Archbishop Corrigan on Sunday last:

MOST REVEREND SIR: Last Saturday a liberal Catholic (he calls himself O'Donoghue) made the assertion in one of the leading morning papers that an attempt was made on the part of authority to coerce the priests of New York to sign an address to your grace wherein we assure you of our loyalty, obedience, and disapproval of the action for the Rev. Dr. McGlynn in the Henry George revolutionary movement.

Now, we declare said assertion entirely false. We, the German priests of New York city who have signed the document, were informed that we were perfectly at liberty to sign or refuse our signatures. We put our names to the address freely and without compulsion or coercion. Several of our number have not as yet been requested to sign, but they are anxious to have an opportunity to do so. If we had been requested by any one to sign an address indorsing the Henry George land confiscation or robber theory, we would have refused our signatures firmly and emphatically.

We have been taught from childhood that the church of Christ is a perfectly organized society, wherein the bishop of Rome is the supreme teacher and judge in matters of faith and regulation of morality. The bishops are teachers and judges in their respective territory. All the faithful, priests as well as laity, are obliged to respect and obey their bishop, but they have the liberty to appeal from their decision to Rome. When Rome has spoken bishops and people submit.

"Roma locuta causa finita." What would intelligent men say if a contestant in a lawsuit should insult the judge and jury and appeal from them to the spectators in the court room for a final decision?

The Catholic church is the militant church in the spiritual order, her commander in chief is the pope, her division generals are the bishops, her officers the clergy. The church is constantly engaged in wars against the devil and the false maxims and principles of the infidel world. Now, if at the time of war a subordinate officer should disobey his general, and by eloquent appeals seduce the soldiers into insubordination, what would be done with this rebellious officer? If a general in battle should disobey the positive commands of the general in chief, what would be his punishment? A good Catholic will obey his pastors, a good priest will obey his commander, the bishop, and all will obey the commander in chief, the holy father, in matters of faith and morality.

For the last six months the Catholic clergy of New York have been persistently misrepresented by certain parties as if they were followers of Henry George and sympathizers of the Rev. Dr. McGlynn in his defiant attitude to civil and ecclesiastical laws and constitutional enactments. We have borne these misrepresentations patiently in the hope that Dr. McGlynn and his followers might have time to reflect and retract their revolutionary doctrines. But when the public papers represent these men in their insubordination to legitimate authority as the representatives and champions of the Catholic priests of New York, and when our silence would be taken as

acquiescence, patience ceases to be a virtue, and we are forced by our convictions and the loyalty and obedience we owe the church into a solemn protest against these accusations.

We, the undersigned, have no sympathy with revolutionary or communist doctrines, we cannot approve of the actions of men who endeavor to destroy the respect and obedience due to law and legitimate authority, be the same civil or ecclesiastical.

Assuring your grace of our deep felt sympathy in your present fight for law, authority and justice, we are your obedient sons in Christ.

This address is signed by the Rev. John Maguire, the Rev. John Daily and some fifty other "German priests."

The Archbishop's Last Effort to Get Him-
self Indorsed.

New York Tribune.

The recent attempt to coerce the Catholic clergy of this diocese into signing a condemnation of Dr. McGlynn has proved a failure. The terms in which Dr. McGlynn, his numerous friends of the clergy, and the parishioners of St. Stephen's church were alluded to were too odious and the glare of publicity too strong for the project. Now the archbishop's friends have rewritten the document, omitting Dr. McGlynn's name, and have mailed it to such priests as they think can be depended on to sign it. This was sent out, accompanied by a letter signed by Father Lynch as "secretary," last Tuesday or Wednesday. The real purpose of the document is disclosed by the frank statement, made by Father Lynch himself to several of the clergy, that "it was for use at Rome against the efforts of Cardinal Gibbons and Bishop Keane."

MOST REVEREND ARCHBISHOP: We, the priests of the archdiocese of New York, come before you to express our sincere attachment to you and our unfeigned and cheerful loyalty to your authority. We recognize in you our ecclesiastical superior, who, being in full communion with the head of the Catholic church, the successor of St. Peter, lawfully rule, teach and judge this portion of the flock of Christ—the archdiocese of New York.

"Conformably to the exhortation of St. Paul, we look up to you as our 'prelate who speaks to us the word of God, whose faith we follow.' And, pondering the grave injunction of the same apostle, 'Obey your prelates and be subject to them, for they watch as being to render an account of your souls, that they may do this with joy and not with grief; for this is not expedient for you.' Hebrews, xiii, 17. We desire also on this occasion to record our emphatic disapproval and reprobation of the act of disobedience and disloyalty to your authority of which a certain member of our body has made himself guilty—an act of disloyalty aggravated by his subsequent course. We have been patiently hoping and praying that our dear brother would change his mind and return to his father's house. But observing that our charitable silence is construed into acquiescence in and approval of disobedience and that it causes some surprise both here and abroad—learning, moreover, that it is publicly asserted that he is believed to uphold the cause of the clergy in general, we feel it our duty to make this solemn declaration to you, that the clergy of the archdiocese of New York utterly condemn all disobedience to lawfully constituted authority, especially to the authority of the church, and can have no sympathy with the efforts of those who in any way set that authority aside. Our motto shall always be, 'An obedient man shall speak of victory.' Proverbs, xxi, 28."

Dr. McGlynn's Case From an English Point
of View.

BIRMINGHAM, England, April 6.—THE STANDARD has pleased me very much, and, as for the McGlynn episode, you are making history. For many years past my respect and esteem for the Irish and English Catholic priests has steadily increased, and, Protestant as I am, I have come to the conclusion that they are more truly the followers of Christ in their intimate connection with the sorrows and joys of the "common people," and their deep helpful sympathy with the sufferings of the poor, than are the ministers of any other sect that I have come in contact with. In them, rather than in the pomp and glory of Rome, is to be found the secret of the strength of the Catholic church, and if the facts of the case are once fairly brought under the notice of the people aware of the influence of the Italian cardinals, he will doubtless see the significance of Father McGlynn's noble protest on behalf of downtrodden humanity, and realize the vital importance to the church herself at this juncture (when the laborers of Great Britain and Ireland have become the masters of the United Kingdom) that nothing be done in her name out of harmony with the words of the Master: "Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." No church can hope to continue to exist much longer that is not in hearty felt sympathy with the poor.

THOMAS F. WALKER.

Easter Sunday at St. Stephen's.

On Easter Sunday, at the ten o'clock mass in St. Stephen's church, thirteen pews were kept locked and empty, while scores of the poorer parishioners remained standing. Father Colton announced from the altar that the church debt was \$135,000, an increase of \$5,000 since January 1!

Priests Who Sympathize With the Arch-
bishop.

Fathers Colton and Callahan of St. Stephen's are said, on good authority, to have signed the first address to the archbishop, in which Dr. McGlynn was characterized as "vain and vindictive." The names of Father O'Kelly and Father Dougherty of St. Monica's were appended to the same document, Father Dougherty is a member of the ninth regiment, the members of which are highly indignant at his action.

GOOD LAND DOCTRINE IN POTTSTOWN, PA.

is sending portions of their wages to parents poorer than themselves.

The Kingdom Come.

O God, and still Thy children suffer want!
O God, and still Thy children suffer want!
O God, and still Thy children suffer want!
O God, and still Thy children suffer want!

Thy kingdom come. How often has the
prayer
Gone up to Thee since Christ, the poor man's
friend.
First told His humble followers how to pray.
From millions homes the prayer goes up to-day
To Thee, and still no answer dost Thou send,
Or so it seems, for want and crime are here.

And yet, O Father, wherefore the delay?
Whose fault that want and crime walk
Laud in hand?
Whose fault that want and crime walk
Laud in hand?

But selfish greed, and Ignorance, and Fear,
A band of triple tyrants, rule the land
And thwart the prayer they offer day by day.
O God! I see a home—a million homes
So poor and comfortless, bare even to tears:
Nor paint, nor carpet on the hard, rough
floor;

Some chairs, a table, bed and stove, no more;
And they have lived in such a home for
years,
And still the prayer goes up, "Thy kingdom
come."

And hard the father toils through long, long
hours:
The mother drudges, and the children, too,
Must work to eke out the poor meager fare.
No chance for knowledge to gain entrance
there;

No chance the gentler virtues there to woo,
But chance enough for all the evil powers.
And when the father drinks—the children
swear,
Or steal, or worse—and bitterness and hate
Fills every heart where should be only love—
With cold philosophy free thinkers prove
"The law that millions doom to such a fate;
'Tis God, the Christian say," then wherefore
care?

Or wherefore vex and sadden all our years
In feeling all the woes of wretched men
Whom God has doomed to toil, and want,
and sin,
That the elect, the wealthy few, may win
Leisure for wisdom, virtue, joy, and then,
At last, a place where comes not death or
tears?

We do not like to hear of poverty,
That hot bed of disease, and sin, and crime.
We preach that thrift and virtue is its dower.
With ease, we see not. Have we lost the
power?
Has self and greed, then, made us deaf and
blind?
And made our worship worse than blasphemy?

We quote, "Ye always with you have the
poor."
And make a prophecy of what was meant
But as a statement of the facts that then
Existed. But a time in vain seek, when
The Christ or prophet in God's Bible lent
His voice to justify so crust a state.

Let us not dare to pray—giving the while
A paltry sum, degrading charity,
To show our ignorance or greed has robbed
Of justice, their divine inheritance,
And doomed them slaves when God has
made them free.

Let us not dare to pray "Thy kingdom come!"
Let us not dare, till we have done our part
With justice and pen or freeman's vote to win
Them justice and to blot this deadly stain
From off our souls. Nor ignorant remain
Of all their wrongs, for ignorance is sin.
—Let us not dare to harden still the heart.

For God is just. He will avenge the wrong
Done to his children by their brothers here.
The silent, voiceless agony ascends
From prisoned souls to Him in heaven, and
New strength to outraged laws divine.
Then fear eternal justice, sure, and swift and
strong.

—MRS. ELIZABETH JOHNSON.
Fiction, Oct., April 13, 1887.

MR. VAN GRIP'S FORTUNE.

In 1840 Mr. Van Grip purchased from
the Van Snort estate a lot of land fronting
on Broadway, below Fulton street, for
\$25,000. An old building stood on the lot
at that time, and Mr. Van Grip had it
torn down and a new building erected in
its stead. The new building cost \$100,000
and created no little stir and gossip in
New York in those days. Besides giving
a minute description of it in their news
columns, the *Bugle* and *Bladder* treated
the subject editorially and in glowing terms
praised the enterprise and public spirit of
Mr. Van Grip, and wound up with a wish
that New York were blessed with more
men like him. Enterprise and public spirit
were not Mr. Van Grip's only virtues. He
was a religious, God-fearing gentleman, a
loving husband, a good father, a thorough
business man who was not too proud to
look after his own affairs, which he always
kept in the straightest order, keeping ac-
curate accounts of all his transactions so
that at any moment he could tell exactly
how he stood with respect to any
particular one of them; in short, he was a
model man—a man to be looked up to and
copied.

Years rolled by, bringing poverty, hunger
and rage to many and riches, plenty and
fine linen to a few. The civil war broke
out, and thousands of hot-headed patriots
left home and kindred to sacrifice their
lives on the altar of freedom. Hitherto it
had been a cast iron rule with Mr. Van
Grip to personally represent himself on all
occasions where matters of any moment
were at issue, but in this case he was satis-
fied to appear by proxy. So he hired an
agent to represent him at the "front," and
remained at home himself to look after the
interests of society and to see that the
business of the metropolis was carried on
in a shipshape manner. The public weal
demanded this, and as Mr. Van Grip was
a heavy taxpayer, the city could not very
well spare him. He was one of her repre-
sentative men.

In 1886 Mr. Van Grip died, in the lan-
guage of the eminent divines who officiated
at the funeral services, "universally re-
gretted," and was peacefully laid to rest in
the family plot, where a handsome marble
shaft records his many virtues for the ed-
ification of future generations.

Early in 1887 the lot of land and the
building (now an old one) on Broadway
were sold in partition proceedings for the
sum of \$250,000. I have in-
cidentally remarked above that Mr. Van
Grip kept accurate accounts of all his
transactions, and I here take the liberty of
glancing at the accounts relative to this
particular one, not to satisfy any morbid
curiosity, but simply with a view of learn-
ing a lesson from the enterprise and public
spirit of this exemplary gentleman.

The account is written in a neat hand,
every "4" is dotted and every "5" is crossed,

and it is most beautifully ruled off in red
ink. On the debit side are entered pay-
ments for taxes, water rates, insurance, re-
pairs, etc., and interest at the legal rate on
the \$125,000 invested; and on the credit
side appear the amounts of rent received.
For the first three years (1841-3) the debit
and credit sides of the accounts exactly
balance. During the following seven
years (1844-50) the credits exceed the debits
by \$5,500; from 1851 to 1860 the excess of
credits over debits is \$11,000; from 1861 to
1870 this excess amounts to \$12,500; from
1871 to 1880 the excess amounts up to \$14,-
000; and from 1881 to 1886, inclusive, it is
\$8,000; the grand total of excess of rents
over and above payments for taxes, insur-
ance, water rates, repairs, etc., and the
amounts which Mr. Van Grip allowed him-
self for interest on the principal sum in-
vested during the forty-six years being
\$51,000.

Now let us work out two little problems,
one in subtraction and the other in addi-
tion. From the price at which the property
was sold in 1887, namely, \$250,000, deduct
the cost price, namely, \$125,000, and there
remains \$125,000, to which add
\$51,000, and we find that the net profit on
this little transaction was \$76,000. Of
course, I have not taken into consideration
interest on the surplus of receipts over dis-
bursements which accrued annually from
1844 to 1886, and of which surplus Mr. Van
Grip was sufficiently enterprising and pub-
lic spirited to take appropriate advantage.

Two hundred and seventy-six thousand
dollars! Phew! To think it makes my
head swim. What genius! What enter-
prise! What public spirit! Compare this
with the puny efforts of twenty pigmy con-
temporaries of Mr. Van Grip. Those
twenty clogs of humanity started in the
race with him. They drudged and delved
for twenty years (1840-60), and as the result
of their drudging and delving averaged
\$250 a year per man, they all earning dur-
ing the twenty years \$210,000, which these
good-for-nothing fellows squandered as fast
as they earned it. The war broke out and
the whole twenty marched off to the
"front," from which six of them returned
alive to resume their drudging and delving.

For the next twenty-two years (1860-80) the
total amount earned by those six nobodies
was \$66,000, or \$5500 yearly a man. This
they likewise spent as fast as they earned
it, in riotous living and panpining of the
flesh. And then those six nobodies died
and were buried out of sight and into their
miserable graves, whereon not as much as
a wooden stake is placed to remind the
passer by that such pigmies lived.

Here we have the bright example of one
enterprising, public spirited gentleman,
earning and saving on one of his transac-
tions as much as twenty nobodies earned
and squandered. Just think of it!

We have said one of his transactions,
for this was only one of a number of like
ones in which Mr. Van Grip had been en-
gaged during those forty-six years. When
that worthy gentleman died his estate was
found to be worth over \$2,000,000—"all in
ready," as the lawyers expressed it. Any
reader of THE STANDARD, if he wishes to
form a fair estimate of the enterprise and
public spirit of this great man, can do so,
approximately at least, by working out a
little problem in the rule of three. For in-
stance, suppose the earnings of Mr. Van
Grip over and above those of ordinary men
for those forty-six years to form a like por-
tion of the \$2,000,000 to that which
they actually did of the \$51,000, we can
find out in a jiffy how much his entire
earnings during that period amount to.

Let us see:
\$51,000 : 2,000,000 :: 276,000.
Multiply our second term by our third
and divide the product by our first. There
you are, sir, \$1,377,142.85; that is the
amount of Mr. Van Grip's extra earnings
during the forty-six years.

Again, if it takes twenty nobodies under
certain circumstances and conditions forty-
six years to earn \$276,000, how many no-
bodies, working under similar circum-
stances and conditions and for a similar
period, will it take to earn \$1,377,142.85?
276,000 : 1,377,142.85 :: 20.

Multiply our second term by our third
and divide the product by our first. An-
swer 114 78857-376000 nobodies. A frac-
tion of a nobody does not amount to much,
so we will discard the fraction and call it
114.

Gracious, goodness me, what an enter-
prising, public spirited man Mr. Van Grip
was!

It warms the cockles of my heart to
contemplate him. Just think of it. He
earned and saved more than 114 of the
ordinary run of men earned and squan-
dered.
Pondering over these figures an idea
occurred to me, and as I am not one of those
who keep their light under a bushel, I give
it to the readers of THE STANDARD. It is
this: The sole object of life nowadays is
money. Granted. There are over 50,000,-
000 human beings in these United States
at the present writing. Now, suppose that
one-fifth of these are able-bodied men
(which they are not, but we will suppose
so), engaged in a terribly earnest pursuit
of that object, and suppose again that in
every 115 of these 10,000,000 there is one
Mr. Van Grip and 114 incapable nobodies.
Now let us figure out that and see what it
comes to:

115 : 10,000,000 :: 1:
Proceed as we have done above and we
find that there are 86,956 12-23 Mr. Van
Grips and 9,913,043 11-23 incapable nobodies
who are unwilling or unable to accomplish
anything toward the object referred to—
money.

Now I have come to the idea. Listen:
Let those 9,913,043 11-23 incapable no-
bodies be quietly choked, or burned, or per-
haps, it would be cheaper to dump them into
the sea, and then after that has been done
let us strangle all the nobody infants as
fast as they appear and save and carefully
raise the Van Grip infants; if—but, hang it,
here comes this terrible "if"! How are
we to recognize the Van Grip infants?
There's the rub. Perhaps some reader of
THE STANDARD may devise a mode of ob-
viating this little difficulty.

Some men are curious animals. I related
the facts above written to my friend Pete
Drudger, and instead of appreciating the
enterprise and public spirit of Mr. Van
Grip as they deserve, he metaphorically
tore that respectable gentleman's memory
to tatters, said he never did an honest day's
work in his life, said he was nothing but a
bloated spider who lay idly in his hole, and
watched an opportunity to prey upon the
poor nobodies, said that the \$1,557,142.85 of
rent belonged to the 114 nobodies I spoke of,
then branched off into some nonsense about
"unearned increment," or some such stuff,
and finally wound up by calling me a fool,
and said that if my "idiotic ideas" about

burning, choking and drowning could, by
any possible means, be carried into execu-
tion, I should be the first victim, as he had
never known a more incapable nobody
than I am; whereupon I left him. There
is no use in trying to reason with such
men.
OWEN FITZSIMONS.

WEALTH WITHOUT WORK.

Seizing What God Meant for All Men's Use
and Growing Rich by Selling It.

The career of the Willets brothers smacks
of the romantic. For years they followed the
lumber business in Allegheny county, New
York, clearing a tract of land left them by
their father, one of the pioneers of that sec-
tion. In 1870 they were worth perhaps \$50,-
000 apiece and 2,000 acres of fallow land. The
developments of the Allegheny field showed
that the land was in the heart of the belt. Re-
fusing all offers to lease they developed in
person what proved a genuine gold mine.
Charles Young, who had formerly been in
their employ and had purchased a portion of
their land and turned farmer, was also sur-
prised to find himself a rich man. Not con-
tent with his first success all three have
been following up developments ever since,
and have been uniformly successful, ranking
among the several times millionaires of oldom.

At the same time that Isaac Willets pur-
chased the Muncie farm John McKewen pur-
chased the farm of the Muncie heirs directly
north. The venture has proved a most for-
tunate one, and Mr. McKewen's income there-
from now amounts to nearly \$2,000 a day. The
career of this gentleman has been even more
varied and romantic than that of the Willets
brothers. Less than twenty-five years ago
he landed at Castle garden, an Irish im-
migrant with scarcely a dollar in his pocket.
He tried his hands at various things, but
finally drifted into the oil regions and became
a driller. His first ventures on his own ac-
count were failures, and on several occasions
he saw his all swept into the hands of the
sheriff. But after each reverse he went to
work with renewed energy to recover what
he had lost, and when the Bradford field was
opened his fortunes changed. He was early
in the field, and secured some choice leases.
He sold one, and with the proceeds developed
the remainder. A year later he was a mil-
lionaire, and his wealth was constantly in-
creasing, until he was clear in years ago. South
of the Muncie field, leading north in the de-
velopment of every new field, and his losing
ventures have been few and far between.
To-day he has millions invested in bonds,
owns one of the most extensive ranches in
Colorado and is rated by the trade as the
largest single oil producer in the world.

Captain J. J. Vandegrift of the Standard
oil company leased the Barre farm, south
of the Smith, and struck a series of gushers
that added materially to his immense wealth.
He disposed of his interest in the Barre only
to develop the Taylorstown pool, where he
now has another fortune in prospect. South
of the Barre farm lies the three-acre lot,
the property of a man named Stewart, who
gained a living by the manufacture and sale
of a salve warranted to cure all ills. Two
years ago Stewart's lot and house would have
sold for less than \$500. In March of last year
he leased the lot, only large enough for one
well, to Joseph Craig for one-fourth royalty.
The result was a well that for weeks did over
two thousand barrels a day and is still a
strong producer. Stewart has purchased a
farm and permanently retired from the salve
trade. Craig's interest in the Washington
field has cleared him \$300,000. Ad-
joining the Stewart lot was another, still
smaller, the property of "Mammy" Miller, an
aged colored woman. This was leased by a
couple of Washington merchants with com-
fortable bank accounts, who drilled a well
that for months had a daily production of
over one thousand barrels. Its owners have
more than trebled their investment and
"Mammy" Miller is the most popular member
of her race in Washington county. F. B.
Hallam and J. N. Edgerly, two young busi-
ness men of Washington, leased the Davis
farm, where the oil was first discovered, but
for some unknown reason destroyed the lease.
Davis then leased it to the Union oil company.
The farm is now valued at \$400,000 and the
original lessees have sued Davis for \$100,000
damages and the recovery of their rights.

R. H. Thayer went a mile in advance of
developments in a southwesterly direction,
and struck three or four good wells and one
gusher that, for a time, netted him an income
of \$2,000 a day. Pat Galligan, an old-timer,
who drilled the Smith well, leased and de-
veloped the Taylor farm, and is growing rich.
The Washington natural gas company, a local
organization, has cleared \$200,000. F. C. &
Emerson, whose joint possessions fifteen years
ago would not have amounted to \$1,000, but
who have since made millions by their opera-
tions in natural gas, leased the Manifold farm,
to the west of the Smith. Their first well,
for a time, gave them a monthly income of
\$30,000, and their subsequent ventures have
repeated, in varying degree, this initial suc-
cess.

Propagating the Faith in England.
The English land restoration league, which,
as the title indicates, advocates the restora-
tion of the land of England to the whole
people of England, is busily propagating the
faith by means of lectures and the distribution
of tracts. The following is taken from one
of their tracts:

Organizer of co-operative guild—Well what
can you do?

Blacksmith—I can make springs and axles
for carriages, and shoe your horses.

Organizer—Come in, Mr. Blacksmith.

Mason—I can build your barns, bridges,
houses and stables.

Organizer—Very well, come in; we cannot
do without you.

Shoemaker—I can make boots and shoes for
you.

Organizer—We must have you, Mr. Shoemaker.

(In turn all the trades and professions
applied, till at last a landlord came who
wanted to become a member.)

Organizer—And what are you?

Landlord—I am a landlord.

Organizer—What do you do for a livelihood?

Landlord—Oh, I take toll of all of you. The
laborer pays me for the right to dig, the miner
for the right to burrow in the earth, and the
bricklayer for permission to build a house.

Organizer—But what can you do?

Landlord—I can make your laws, and when
I have made them I can administer them. If
a man snarls a hare I give him six months; if
he shoots a snipe I give him three. I can drive
men to desperation, and to the uttermost part
of the earth. I can prevent the erection of
cottages, or the building of a Methodist
chapel. I can look on and take the larger
share of the prosperity of the farmer, the
shopkeeper and the manufacturer.

Organizer—And what else can you do?

Landlord—I can bring the hair of the aged
to the grave with sorrow; I can break
the heart of the wife and blast the prospects
of men of talent and enterprise.

Organizer—Is that all you can do?

Landlord—Good heavens! is not that
enough?

Of Course He Must Be Crazy.

George Francis Train to Evening Star reporter.

"Omaha! Yes, I saw that was the place
for a city of millions. I jumped ashore and
found a hat lying in the road. Nothing else
there. Now there is a city. I owned half of
it once. You know how people live? Ten
own everything and ninety own nothing. I
saw if I held that land I would be one of
ten. I didn't want to swim with ninety men
on my back. I said, 'Take your city; I don't
want it,' and left them to do as they pleased.
Now I sit here, and it costs me only a dollar
a day to live."

UNEMPLOYED LABOR.

From "Social Problems," Chapter XIII.

Consider this terrible phenomenon, the
tramp—an appearance more menacing to the
republic than that of hostile armies and fleets
bent on destruction. What is the tramp? In
the beginning, he is a man able to work, and
willing to work, for the satisfaction of his
needs; but who, not finding opportunity to
work where he is, starts out in quest of it;
who, failing in this search, is, in a later stage,
driven by those imperative needs to beg or to
steal, and so, losing self-respect, loses all that
animates and elevates and stimulates a man
to struggle and to labor; becomes a vagabond
and an outcast—a poisonous malarial, avenging
on society the wrong that he keenly, but
vaguely, feels has been done him by society.

Yet the tramp, known as he is now from the
Atlantic to the Pacific, is only a part of the
phenomenon. Behind him, though not obtru-
sive, save in what we call "hard times," there
is, even in what we now consider normal
times, a great mass of unemployed labor
which is unable, unwilling, or not yet forced
to tramp, but which leans to the tramp the
same reason that the submerged part of an
iceberg does to the much smaller part which
shows above the surface.

The difficulty which so many men who
would gladly work to satisfy their needs find
in obtaining opportunity to do so, is so com-
mon as to occasion no surprise; nor, save
when it becomes particularly intensified, to
arouse any inquiry. We are used to it that,
although we all know that work is in itself
desirable, and that there never yet was a
human being who wanted work for the sake
of work, we have got into the habit of think-
ing and talking as though work were itself
a goal, and that this idea were implanted in
the common mind that we maintain a policy
based on the notion that the more work we do
for foreign nations and the less we allow them
to do for us, the better off we shall be; and in
public and in private we hear men lauded and
enterprises advocated because they "furnish
employment," while there are many who,
with more or less definiteness, hold the idea
that labor saving inventions have operated
injuriously by lessening the amount of work
to be done.

Manifestly, there is not an end, but a means;
manifestly, there can be no real scarcity of
work, until the means of satisfying man's
needs, until human wants are satisfied.

How, then, shall we explain the obvious facts
that lead men to think and speak as though
work were in itself desirable?
When we consider that labor is the pro-
ducer of all wealth, the creator of all values,
is it not strange that labor should experience
difficulty in finding employment? The ex-
change for commodities that which gives
value to all commodities ought to be the most
certain and easy of exchanges. One wishing
to exchange labor for food or clothing, or
any of the manifold things which labor pro-
duces, is like one wishing to exchange gold
for coin, cotton for cloth, or wheat for
flour. This is hardly a parallel, for as
the terms upon which the exchange of labor
for commodities takes place are usually that
the labor is first rendered, the man who offers
labor in exchange generally proposes to
produce and render value before value is
returned to him.

This being the case, why is not the com-
petition of employers to obtain workmen as
great as the competition of workmen to find
employment? Why is it that we do not con-
sider the man who does work as the obliging
party rather than the man who, as we say,
furnishes work?

So it necessarily would be, if in saying that
labor is the producer of wealth, we stated
the whole case. But labor is only the pro-
ducer of wealth in the sense of being the
active factor of production. For the produc-
tion of wealth labor must have access to pre-
existing substance and natural forces. Man
has no power to bring something out of noth-
ing. He cannot create an atom of matter or
initiate the slightest motion. Vast as are his
powers of modifying matter and utilizing
force, they are merely powers of adapting,
changing, recombining, what previously ex-
ists. The substance of the land with which I
write, the lines of the paper on which I
write, have previously formed the substance of
other men and other animals, of plants, soils,
atmospheres, probably of other worlds and
other systems. And so of the force which
impels my pen. All we know of it is that it
has acted and reacted through what seem to
us eternal circles, and appears to reach this
planet from the sun. The destruction of mat-
ter and motion, as the creation of matter and
motion, are to us unthinkable.

In the human being, in some mysterious way
which neither the researches of physiologists
nor the speculations of philosophers enable us
to comprehend, conscious, planning intelli-
gence comes into control for a limited time
and to a limited extent, of the matter and
motion contained in the human frame. The
power of contracting and expanding human
muscles is the initial force with which the
human mind acts upon the material world. By
the use of this power other powers are uti-
lized, and the forms and relations of matter
are changed in accordance with human de-
sire. But how great soever be the power of
affecting and using external nature which
human intelligence thus obtains—and how great
this may be we are only beginning now to re-
alize—it is still only the power of affecting and
using what previously exists. Without access
to external nature, without the power of avail-
ing himself of her substance and forces, man
is not merely powerless to produce anything,
he ceases to exist in the material world. He
himself, in physical body at least, is but a
changing form of matter, a passing mode of
motion, that must be continually drawn from
the reservoirs of external nature.

Without either of the three elements, land,
air and water, man could not exist; but he
is peculiarly a land animal, living on its surface
and drawing from it his supplies. Though he
is able to navigate the ocean, and may some
day be able to navigate the air, he can only
do so by availing himself of natural forces drawn
from land. Land is to him the great store-
house of materials and reservoir of forces
upon which he must draw for his needs. And
as wealth consists of materials and products
of nature which have been secured or mod-
ified by human exertion so as to fit them for
the satisfaction of human desires (D), labor is
the active factor in the production of wealth,
but land is the passive factor, without which
labor can neither produce nor exist.

All this is so obvious that it may seem like
wasting space to state it. Yet, in this ob-
vious fact lies the explanation of that enigma
that so many seem a hopeless puzzle—the
labor question. What is inexplicable, if we
lose sight of man's absolute and constant de-
pendence upon land, is clear when we recog-
nize it.

Let us suppose, as well as we can, human
society in a world as near as possible like our
own, with one essential difference. Let us
suppose this imaginary world and its in-
habitants so constructed that men could sup-
ply themselves in air, and could from the
material of the air produce by their labor
what they needed for nourishment and use.
I do not mean to suppose a state of things
in which men could float around in the air
like fish in the ocean, but that they could
display the prime necessities of animal life
from what they could pick up. I am merely
trying to suppose a state of things in which
men as they are were relieved of absolute de-
pendence upon land for a standing place and
food.

(However great be its utility, nothing can
be created as wealth unless it requires labor for its
production; nor however much labor has been required for
its production, can anything retain the character of
wealth longer than it can gratify desire.)

reservoir of material and forces. We will
suppose labor to be as necessary as with us,
human desires to be as boundless as with us,
the cumulative power of labor to give to cap-
ital as much advantage as with us, and the
division of labor to have gone as far as with
us—the only difference being (the idea of)
claiming the air as private property not hav-
ing been thought of, that no human creature
would be compelled to make terms with an-
other in order to get a resting place, and to
obtain access to the materials and forces with-
out which labor cannot produce. In such a
state of things, no matter how minute had
become the division of labor, no matter how
great had become the accumulation of capital,
or how far labor saving inventions had been
carried, there could never be anything that
seemed like an excess of the supply of labor
over the demand for labor; there could never
be any difficulty in finding employment; and
the spectacle of willing men, having in their
own brains and muscles the power to satisfy
the needs of themselves and their fam-
ilies, yet compelled to beg for work or for
alms, could never be witnessed. It being in
the power of every one able to labor to apply
his labor directly to the satisfaction of his
needs without asking leave of any one else,
that cut throat competition, in which men
who must find employment or starve are
forced to bid against each other, could never
arise.

Variations there might be in the demand for
particular commodities or services, which
would produce variations in the demand for
labor in different occupations, and cause
wages in those occupations to sometimes rise
above or fall below the general level, but the
ability of labor to employ itself, the freedom
of indefinite expansion in the primary occu-
pations, would allow labor to accommodate it-
self to these variations, not merely without
loss or suffering, but so easily that they would
be scarcely noticed. For occupations shade
into one another by imperceptible degrees, no
matter how minute the division of labor—or,
rather, the more minute the division of labor,
the more insensible the gradation—so that
there are in each occupation enough who
could easily pass to other occupations, to
readily allow of such contractions and ex-
pansions as might be in a state of freedom occur-
ring. The possibility of indefinite expansion in
the primary occupations, the ability of every one
to make a living by resort to them, would pro-
duce elasticity throughout the whole indus-
trial system.

Under such conditions capital could not op-
press labor. At present, in any dispute be-
tween capital and labor, capital enjoys the
enormous advantage of being better able to
wait. Capital wastes when not employed;
but labor starves. Where, however, labor
could always employ itself, the disadvantage
in any conflict would be on the side of capital,
while that surplus of unemployed labor which
capital is unable to make such advantageous
bargains with labor would not exist. The
man who wanted to get others to work for
him would not find men crowding for em-
ployment, but finding all labor already em-
ployed, would have to offer higher wages, in order to
tempt them into his employment, than the
men he wanted could make for themselves.
The competition would be that of employers
to obtain workmen, rather than that of work-
men to get employment, and thus the ad-
vantages which the accumulation of capital
gives in the production of wealth would (save
enough to secure the accumulation and em-
ployment of capital) go ultimately to labor.
In such a state of things, instead of thinking
that the man who employed another was do-
ing him a favor, we would rather look upon
the man who went to work for another as the
obliging party.

To suppose that under such conditions there
could be such inequality in the distribution
of wealth as we now see, would require a
more violent presumption than we have made
in supposing air, instead of land, to be the
element from which wealth is chiefly derived.
But supposing existing inequalities to be trans-
lated into such a state, it is evident that large
fortunes could still exist, and continue but a
short time. Where there is always labor
looking for employment on any terms, where
the masses earn only a bare living, and dismissal
from employment means anxiety and priva-
tion, and even beggary or starvation, these
large fortunes have monstrous power. But in
a condition of things where there was no un-
employed labor, where every one could make
a living for himself and family without fear
or favor, what could a hundred or five hun-
dred millions avail in the way of enabling its
possessor to extort or tyrannize?

The upper millstone alone cannot grind.
That it may do so the nether millstone as well
is needed. No amount of force will break an
eggshell if exerted on one side alone. So cap-
ital could not squeeze labor as long as labor
was free to natural opportunities; and in a
world where these natural materials and op-
portunities were as free to all as is the air to us,
there could be no difficulty in finding employ-
ment, no willing hands conjoined with hungry

